13:12:40

## IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

FOR THE DISTRICT OF DELAWARE

PUREWICK CORPORATION,
)

Plaintiff,
) C.A. No. 22-102(MN)

v.
)

SAGE PRODUCTS, LLC,
)
Defendant.
)

Friday, February 17, 2023 1:00 p.m. Markman Hearing

844 King Street Wilmington, Delaware

BEFORE: THE HONORABLE MARYELLEN NOREIKA
United States District Court Judge

## APPEARANCES:

SHAW KELLER LLP

BY: JOHN W. SHAW, ESQ.

-and-

QUINN EMANUEL URQUHART & SULLIVAN

BY: BRIAN P. BIDDINGER, ESQ.

BY: NICOLE FELICE, ESQ.

Counsel for the Plaintiff

## APPEARANCES CONTINUED:

2

1

YOUNG CONAWAY STARGATT & TAYLOR, LLP

3

BY: ANNE SHEA GAZA, ESQ. BY: SAMANTHA G. WILSON, ESQ.

4

-and-

5

McANDREWS HELD & MALLOY

6

BY: CHRISTOPHER M. SCHARFF, ESQ.

7

BY: RYAN J. PIANETTO, ESQ.

•

BY: ROBERT SURRETTE, ESQ.

8

Counsel for the Defendant

9

10

11

1

12:43:1812

13:01:0213

13:01:0314

13:01:0715

13:01:116

13:01:1217

13:01:1418

13:01:1819

13:01:220

13:01:2721

13:01:2822

13:01:2923

13:01:3124

13:01:3425

THE COURT: All right. Good afternoon, everyone, and please be seated. All right. Let's start

Mr. Shaw.

with some introductions.

MR. SHAW: Good afternoon, Your Honor. John
Shaw for Plaintiff, PureWick. Joining me from Quinn
Emanuel, Brian Biddinger and Nicole Felice. Mr. Cherny also
asked me to send his regards. He's in Europe this week and
unable to come.

THE COURT: Ms. Gaza.

MS. GAZA: Good afternoon, Your Honor. Anne
Gaza from Young, Conaway on behalf of Defendant, Sage. I'm
joined today by Christopher Scharff, Robert Surrette, and

13:01:40 1	Ryan Pianetto of McAndrew Held & Malloy, as well as my
13:01:44 2	colleague, Samantha Wilson.
13:01:46 3	THE COURT: Great. Okay. Let's start with the
13:01:51 4	presentations and I'll let Sage go first.
13:01:55 5	MR. SCHARFF: All right. Good morning, Your
13:02:07 6	Honor. Christopher Scharff on behalf of Defendant, Sage
13:02:10 7	Products. I'll start with the next slide which is slide 1.
13:02:13 8	So as Your Honor knows, there are two patents in
13:02:15 9	this lawsuit, the '376 Patent and the '989 Patent, both of
13:02:1910	which are directed to an apparatus or a method for receiving
13:02:2211	discharged urine.
13:02:242	Let's turn to the next slide.
13:02:2513	So the term that we're here to construe is the
13:02:2914	term "fluid reservoir" which is a term that's found in every
13:02:3215	claim of these two patents and it's found repeatedly through
13:02:3516	the claims. For example
13:02:3617	THE COURT: Can I just ask
13:02:3918	MR. SCHARFF: Yes, Your Honor.
13:02:3919	THE COURT: is it your position that this
13:02:4120	term should have its plain and ordinary meaning?
13:02:4421	MR. SCHARFF: It is.
13:02:4422	THE COURT: And your proposal is what you think
13:02:423	is the plain and ordinary meaning?
13:02:4824	MR. SCHARFF: That's exactly right, Your Honor.
13:02:5025	THE COURT: And the test is the plain and

13:02:51 1 13:02:54 2 13:02:56 3 13:02:58 4 13:03:00 5 13:03:01 6 13:03:02 7 13:03:03 8 13:03:06 9 13:03:0810 13:03:1211 13:03:1612 13:03:1913 13:03:2314 13:03:2615 13:03:2916 13:03:3017 13:03:3218 13:03:3619 13:03:3920 13:03:4321 13:03:4622 13:03:4823

13:03:5224

13:03:5425

ordinary meaning to the person of ordinary skill in the art?

MR. SCHARFF: It is, yes.

THE COURT: Is everyone who testified at the trial, the first trial, a person of ordinary skill in the art?

MR. SCHARFF: Yes, Your Honor.

THE COURT: All right.

MR. SCHARFF: So this term appears repeatedly throughout the claims. For example, in claim 1 alone it recites a fluid impermeable casing having a fluid reservoir at the first end, and later it recites that the apparatus has to have a fluid support distinct from that fluid reservoir, a tube disposed in that reservoir and at the end and importantly recites that the apparatus has to be configured so that urine is received into that reservoir.

Next slide.

So what is the parties' disagreement over this term? So here we have the parties' two constructions. So PureWick's construction is that a reservoir is simply anyplace where urine can collect, whereas Sage's construction is a structure that aggregates urine.

So before I get into the differences, I can give a brief preview of why we think the intrinsic evidence supports our construction.

Go to slide 11.

13:03:55 1 13:04:00 2 13:04:04 3 13:04:07 4 13:04:10 5 13:04:13 6 13:04:14 7 13:04:17 8 13:04:20 9 13:04:2310 13:04:2411 13:04:2612 13:04:2913 13:04:3214 13:04:3615 13:04:3916 13:04:4117 13:04:4518 13:04:4819 13:04:5220 13:04:5@1 13:05:0022 13:05:0423 13:05:0824

13:05:1025

So I'll explain how the claims themselves support our construction. For example, they repeatedly refer to the reservoir as a structure. For example, claim 3, wherein the reservoir is formed of polymer. A place can't be formed of polymer.

Slide 12.

I'll explain how the specification repeatedly refers to the reservoir as doing more than just collecting fluid, it also has to hold fluid.

And slide 14.

And then we'll also discuss how in the prosecution history, PureWick specifically told the Patent Office and the public what the definition of a reservoir is, and that's a cavity or part that holds some fluid or secretion, not simply is capable of.

Let's go back to slide 3, please.

All right. So the parties' disagreement over this term is in three areas. So first, collect versus aggregate. Two, whether or not it's enough for something to just hypothetically collect or aggregate urine or whether it must actually be configured for doing that. And then third, whether a reservoir can simply be some arbitrary place in a device or whether it has to be an identifiable structure.

PureWick claims that the differences between these constructions are just semantic. And then obviously

the question is why PureWick didn't agree with our
construction. But as I will explain, these differences are,
in fact, significant.

13:05:17 4

13:05:20 5

13:05:23 6

13:05:27 7

13:05:31 8

13:05:36 9

13:05:4010

13:05:4211

13:05:4712

13:05:4813

13:05:5114

13:05:5515

13:05:5816

13:06:0217

13:06:0418

13:06:0919

13:06:1020

13:06:1221

13:06:1622

13:06:1923

13:06:224

13:06:2625

So before I get into our construction, it helps to understand the context of why the parties are disputing this claim term. So first we're disputing this construction because PureWick is taking a different construction or different position versus what it argued in PureWick I. In PureWick I, PureWick argued that a space in the Van Den Heuvel reference wasn't a reservoir because it didn't actually aggregate urine in use even though urine was channeled into that space.

PureWick II, PureWick is arguing that an alleged space at the end of our device is a reservoir regardless of whether it actually aggregates urine. PureWick says over and over in its brief that it's not taking inconsistent claim construction positions, but they never provide an answer to this. This contradiction is irreconcilable.

Next slide, please.

On top of that, we're also disputing this term
because in this current lawsuit, PureWick has not identified
any actual structure in our accused product that it believes
is a reservoir and that's because PureWick wants a
construction that is so vague and arbitrary that it can
literally just trace out any portion of anyplace in a urine

13:06:30 1 collection device that can collect urine and call that the 13:06:34 2 reservoir.

> So under PureWick's construction, a place that can collect urine, that can include the space between the fibers and the stuffing, the space around the tube, the space in the tube, really anywhere in the device can collect urine. So the issue is that PureWick's construction doesn't do anything to help the jury understand what is and isn't a reservoir and to help third parties, competitors, understand what it is in order to avoid infringement.

> > Next slide, please.

THE COURT: Hold on one second. I want to find something in the brief.

MR. SCHARFF: All right.

THE COURT: In PureWick's paper from yesterday, it says Sage agrees that structure does not require a separate structure. Thus, the reservoir can be an integrally formed part of the casing. Is that correct?

MR. SCHARFF: That's correct, we're not saying it has to be a separate structure.

THE COURT: Accordingly, if structure is used in the construction it would be more accurate to say a structure or part of a structure that provides a place where fluid can collect. Do you agree that the construction could be a structure or part of a structure?

13:06:34 3 13:06:38 4 13:06:42 5 13:06:44 6 13:06:48 7 13:06:51 8 13:06:56 9 13:06:5910 13:07:0311 13:07:0412 13:07:0813 13:07:1314

13:07:1315

13:07:1816

13:07:2217

13:07:248

13:07:3019

13:07:3120

13:07:3321

13:07:3522

13:07:3723

13:07:4124

13:07:425

13:07:49 1 13:07:51 2 13:07:53 3 13:07:57 4 13:08:01 5 13:08:05 6 13:08:06 7 13:08:08 8 13:08:10 9 13:08:1310 13:08:1711 13:08:2012 13:08:2413 13:08:2814 13:08:3315 13:08:3716 13:08:3917 13:08:4018 13:08:4819 13:08:5120 13:09:0021 13:09:022

13:09:1023

13:09:1424

13:09:1725

MR. SCHARFF: I think it's the part of the structure that we would still have the issue with.

THE COURT: But if it's integrated in it, if the reservoir is integrated into the casing, the reservoir is not the entire casing, so why wouldn't it be part of the structure?

MR. SCHARFF: Yeah, so there is still a structure, if that's what you're referring to possibly, but if you're talking about the structure being the end of the casing, that's defining the reservoir. I think our main issue with our construction is if you just say place, a place is unbounded by any reference to a structure, whereas in -- they know, they had repeatedly referred to in the prosecution history a cavity or void space that holds urine, now -- and they repeatedly did that by reference to structures, so the issue is yeah --

THE COURT: I mean, they did say in the prosecution that it's a void space, so why is a space rather than a structure, why is space wrong?

MR. SCHARFF: So if you can, let's go to slide

10. So the issue is space might be fine, but their

construction is place. And everywhere in the prosecution

history, they reference that void, the cavity or void space

by referencing the structures that bounded it.

Now, we obviously agree that reservoir is a

structure and the space inside of that structure, it just
can't be an arbitrary place. You can't just point to say
well, I think the reservoir is the first quarter of an inch
of it, or I think the reservoir is the bottom and I'm going
to trace a jagged line and say that that's the reservoir.

There has to be some way for the public and the jury to know
what is a reservoir and does this accused structure have
one.

THE COURT: Just so we're clear, though, you

THE COURT: Just so we're clear, though, you think space is better than place?

MR. SCHARFF: Yes, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Okay.

MR. SCHARFF: Can we go back to slide 6.

Now, here you can see exactly how PureWick is purposefully being vague. On the left in their claim construction brief they claim that they're expressly saying that the reservoir is just the space at the bottom of the device between the permeable support and the casing, and they say that they are expressly not claiming that the reservoir includes the permeable support. Then if you look on the right, you can see that PureWick does have an arrow that points to the reservoir is including some arbitrary area in the permeable support. And, you know, the reason for that has to do with satisfying other claim limitations.

Next slide, please.

13:09:21 1 13:09:25 2 13:09:29 3 13:09:32 4 13:09:36 5 13:09:39 6 13:09:42 7 13:09:45 8 13:09:45 9 13:09:4710 13:09:5011 13:09:5112 13:09:5113 13:09:5414 13:10:0515 13:10:0816 13:10:117 13:10:1418 13:10:1819 13:10:2020

13:10:3**2**3

13:10:2321

13:10:2722

13:10:3&5

13:10:39 1 13:10:42 2 13:10:45 3 13:10:49 4 13:10:52 5 13:10:54 6 13:10:57 7 13:11:00 8 13:11:03 9 13:11:0310 13:11:0611 13:11:1012 13:11:1413 13:11:1914 13:11:2415 13:11:2716 13:11:3217 13:11:3518 13:11:3719 13:11:4220 13:11:4721 13:11:5222

13:11:5723

13:12:0124

13:12:02/5

So let's turn to the three differences between our claim construction and theirs. So first there is this difference between aggregate and collect. Now, PureWick in its brief now stated that it would be fine with the construction that uses the word "aggregate." If there is an agreement on that, I think we can adopt the word "aggregate," but PureWick is still trying to read the word "aggregate" to mean the same thing as collect and it doesn't.

For example, the specification of the two patents specifically refer to the reservoir collecting and holding urine. The dictionaries that we cited do the same thing. Aggregate again was the word that PureWick used to overcome Van Den Heuvel. If you look in PureWick's brief, they provided some — they provided the definition of aggregate versus collect and they tried to say oh, look, they're the same thing. But one of their own definitions specifically said the definition of aggregate is to collect or gather into a mass or hole, so not just collect.

THE COURT: I just looked up on Thesaruis.com synonyms for aggregate. Amass, accumulate, add, collect, combine, heaped, mixed, piled, total, so collect is listed as a synonym for aggregate. What am I supposed to do with that?

MR. SCHARFF: That may be, but their own

definition specifically says that aggregate is doing more
than collecting, it's collecting and gathering into a mass
or hole and it's that part of it that the word "collect" is
missing. It's this concept of it's holding, it's collecting
and holding urine.

THE COURT: Show me.

MR. SCHARFF: And, Your Honor, also just to back up a bit on the space versus place issue, I wanted to clarify, space alone isn't enough, it has to be a space bounded by something, a structure.

THE COURT: Okay. In the specification it says reservoir 110 can be any suitable shape and/or size capable of collecting fluid transported through the permeable support. So where does that say collecting and holding because you are saying they are defining it as collecting and holding.

MR. SCHARFF: No, Your Honor, to be clear, when I was referring to collecting and holding, I was saying that -- so the specification refers to multiple properties of a reservoir. One of the properties of the reservoir is that it collects, another property is that it holds. Our construction reads on all of those properties, PureWick's construction only reads on one of them. So --

THE COURT: How can you hold it if you're not collecting it?

13:12:03 1 13:12:07 2 13:12:09 3 13:12:13 4 13:12:17 5 13:12:20 6 13:12:29 7 13:12:31 8 13:12:34 9 13:12:3710 13:13:0011 13:13:0112 13:13:043 13:13:1014 13:13:1415 13:13:1816 13:13:1917 13:13:2018 13:13:2419 13:13:220 13:13:2921 13:13:3222

13:13:3523

13:13:3724

13:13:3925

13:13:41 1 13:13:43 2 13:13:45 3 13:13:49 4 13:13:52 5 13:14:00 6 13:14:03 7 13:14:06 8 13:14:09 9 13:14:1210 13:14:1611 13:14:1912 13:14:2313 13:14:2614 13:14:2915 13:14:3316 13:14:3317

13:14:3618

13:14:4119

13:14:4420

13:14:4721

13:14:5222

13:14:5523

13:14:5824

13:15:0125

MR. SCHARFF: So collecting is just drawing something in. And you can collect fluid that just immediately passes through the device, it's never actually held or stored.

So then can we go to slide 8. Now, this is the second dispute that we have is probably a bigger dispute and this is the difference -- a difference that PureWick did not concede and that's the difference between a structure that actually aggregates urine versus just a place that theoretically can do so. Now, again, the claims require a reservoir, not just a structure that's hypothetically capable of having one property of a reservoir. Otherwise under their construction, again, a place where urine can collect, that could read on literally anyplace in any of these devices. Between the fibers. The space around the tube.

Now, the case law that we had cited holds that if a claim recites a specific structure, then to infringe, the accused product must have that actual structure, not just a structure that's capable of being that structure.

I'll note that for the Acco Brands case in particular, PureWick's only argument to distinguish that is they said well Acco involved method claims, so that's inexplicable and that's actually incorrect. It involved an apparatus claim. It was an apparatus claim that had a

13:15:05 1 specific pin structure but that pin structure didn't 13:15:08 2 actually lock, so it wasn't a locking pin even though it could, it was theoretically capable of it, it just wasn't 13:15:11 3 configured to do that, and so as a result there is no 13:15:16 4 13:15:19 5 infringement. 13:15:20 6 As a result there is the VDO case, a District of 13:15:23 7 Delaware case that construed the similar term fuel reservoir 13:15:27 8 13:15:27 9

13:15:2910

13:15:3511

13:15:4212

13:15:4613

13:15:4914

13:15:5215

13:15:5516

13:15:5717

13:16:0118

13:16:0419

13:16:020

13:16:1121

13:16:1522

13:16:1823

13:16:2024

13:16:225

THE COURT: What do we do about your expert's definition when reading his deposition from the prior case, and he says "a casing having a fluid reservoir at the first end and a fluid outlet at the second end, so I used fluid reservoir to mean the same thing that anyone, any ordinary person skilled in the art would understand, it's an area where fluid can collect."

MR. SCHARFF: Yes. So you have the transcript in front of you, PureWick had not cited the statements before and after that. And on page 76 --

THE COURT: I read the ones before where they're just saying what is fluid reservoir and he says I used what the court said and they said well, we didn't -- the court didn't construe it, so what's after?

MR. SCHARFF: Before he's saying it's a fluid reservoir on the first end, he's talking about the first end of the casing, so he is talking about it being defined by

13:16:26 1 some boundary support, and then after --13:16:29 2 THE COURT: He says, "I used fluid reservoir to 13:16:32 3 mean the same thing that anyone, any person, any ordinary person skilled in the art would understand. It's an area 13:16:38 4 where fluid can collect." 13:16:40 5 13:16:41 6 I mean, that's not terribly ambiguous. 13:16:45 7 MR. SCHARFF: And then the --13:16:47 8 THE COURT: And he didn't say it's all 13:16:49 9 structure, whatever. 13:16:5010 MR. SCHARFF: Then the sentence after that, he 13:16:5211 also said it can collect temporarily or collect permanently, 13:16:5612 it shows he's referring to collect in his reference as 13:16:5913 storing. Regardless, so what he said it can't mean 13:17:0514 PureWick's definition because that would be inconsistent with the spec, it would be inconsistent with the prosecution 13:17:0715 13:17:116 13:17:117 THE COURT: Where did he say that? 13:17:1218 MR. SCHARFF: I'm sorry? 13:17:1319 THE COURT: You said that he said that it would 13:17:1520 be inconsistent. 13:17:1721 MR. SCHARFF: No, I'm sorry, Your Honor, I am saying that -- I am saying that their characterization of 13:17:1922 13:17:223 what Mr. Sheldon had said can't mean that he is agreeing with their definition because their definition simply does 13:17:2624

not work with the intrinsic evidence. The intrinsic

13:17:2925

13:17:32 1 13:17:35 2 13:17:38 3 13:17:41 4 13:17:47 5 13:17:52 6 13:17:56 7 13:17:59 8 13:18:01 9 13:18:0510 13:18:0711 13:18:112 13:18:1213 13:18:1414 13:18:1415 13:18:1716 13:18:2017 13:18:2318 13:18:2519 13:18:2720 13:18:2821 13:18:2922 13:18:3223 13:18:3524

13:18:3925

evidence is the most important followed by testimony of experts which would be extrinsic evidence.

THE COURT: Okay. And since I read from the specification where it said the reservoir 110 can be anyplace where urine collects, any suitable shape or size capable of collecting fluid.

MR. SCHARFF: Uh-huh. So that's a description of one property. For example, a car can transport people from point A to point B. That's not a definition of a car.

THE COURT: Yes. But that is a reservoir that is covered in the claims of the patent.

MR. SCHARFF: Absolutely.

THE COURT: Reservoir 110.

MR. SCHARFF: Yep.

THE COURT: So they are defining reservoir 110 as being something that can collect fluids. I'm not understanding why you're saying oh, but they're very clear that it must do more.

MR. SCHARFF: Because that statement is not a definition.

THE COURT: I know it's not a definition, but it's consistent with the plain and ordinary meaning according to your expert and you're saying wait, no, they are saying more in the specification. Tell me what it is that I am supposed to say oh, they're using it in connection

with the plain and ordinary meaning as Defendant's expert recognized, but it's not enough.

13:18:48 3

13:18:51 4

13:18:57 5

13:18:59 6

13:19:01 7

13:19:19 8

13:19:20 9

13:19:2310

13:19:2411

13:19:2612

13:19:2813

13:19:4214

13:20:3915

13:20:4716

13:20:5117

13:20:5518

13:21:0019

13:21:020

13:21:1121

13:21:1422

13:21:1823

13:21:2124

13:21:2425

MR. SCHARFF: Yeah, can we go to slide 12, please. So these are instances in which the specification refers to collecting and holding --

THE COURT: Okay. Hold on. Let me make sure we read those in context. Let me pull that up. Exhibit 3 to what?

MR. SCHARFF: Column 7, Exhibit 3 to our brief, so that's the --

THE COURT: Exhibit 3.

MR. SCHARFF: I'm sorry, this should be Exhibit 1. That should be Exhibit 1, the '376 Patent.

THE COURT: So I guess what I need to understand is as I read from column 7, lines 38 through 52, why is it not that we're starting off with something broad saying the reservoir can be anything, any shape, size, that's capable of collecting fluid, and then they narrow it, some implementations say they can temporarily hold it, in others they can hold large amounts, in some implementations it can collect it and hold it. You want me to say it must collect and hold, and what I am not understanding is why when you start with something broad and then you say some it does this, some in addition it does this, some in addition it does this, why am I supposed to take the last of those

13:21:29 1 things and ignore what started it?

MR. SCHARFF: So I don't think that what we're saying is that these are alternative embodiments. It's describing that the reservoir can either temporarily hold it or it can hold it for a long time. It can hold a large amount. It can hold a small amount. But I don't think that there is -- that it's describing that it is enough to be a reservoir to just collect, period, and never --

THE COURT: Isn't that what it says in the first
-- I mean, it says in the first -- first it says can be any
suitable size or shape capable of collecting fluid.

MR. SCHARFF: Uh-huh.

THE COURT: Any old shape that is capable of collecting. In some implementations, it can be this, for example, this, for example, it can be sized to collect a little bit of urine, then we have in some implementations it can be sized that it holds a lot of urine. In some implementations it can be sized so that it can hold a small or a large amount of urine. In some implementations it's configured to hold -- I mean --

MR. SCHARFF: I think one thing that might help is if we turn to slide 16. So all of these are just describing properties of a reservoir. Saying the reservoir just has to be big enough to collect urine, that does not mean that that is the only property required of a reservoir.

13:21:29 1 13:21:31 2 13:21:34 3 13:21:39 4 13:21:44 5 13:21:47 6 13:21:50 7 13:21:54 8 13:21:58 9 13:22:0010 13:22:0511 13:22:0912 13:22:1013 13:22:1314 13:22:1615 13:22:2216 13:22:2717 13:22:3218

13:22:3619 13:22:4220 13:22:4721

13:22:5**2**3

13:22:5022

13:23:0025

13:23:03 1
13:23:06 2
13:23:10 3
13:23:14 4
13:23:21 5
13:23:25 6

If you look at the ordinary meaning of the term reservoir in the dictionary definitions, they consistently reflect that it is not enough to just collect liquid, it's collect and store. For example, collect it and kept in quantity. So let's go back to slide 12, unless Your Honor would like to look at this more.

Actually let's go back to slide 9, please. So then coming back to this capability versus actuality issue, so again, one of the big things that we're fighting over is whether or not it's enough to just be capable of collecting, aggregating urine or whether it has to actually do so, be configured to do so. One of the things that's telling here is PureWick several times in its brief said that -- pointed to the claims saying that the apparatus is configured to receive urine. And the Federal Circuit has several times said if you use that language configured to, configured to does not mean simply capable of, that it has to be actually designed or constructed to be used that way.

THE COURT: No, I get that. But you're citing a brief and then construing the words they used in the brief.

I'm looking at the specification and the specification doesn't say configured to, it says capable of.

MR. SCHARFF: The claim actually does, Your Honor, at the end of claim 1, for example, it says configured to, claim 1 of the '376 Patent. It is the --

13:23:27 7

13:23:43 9

13:23:37 8

13:23:4710

13:23:5311

13:23:5712

13:24:0013

13:24:0314

13:24:015

13:24:1316

13:24:1717

13:24:2118

13:24:2419

13:24:2920

13:24:3321

13:24:3522

13:24:3&3

13:24:4024

13:24:4325

that last paragraph or limitation, the apparatus configured to be.

13:25:10 3

13:25:12 4

13:25:16 5

13:25:22 6

13:25:25 7

13:25:27 8

13:25:28 9

13:25:2910

13:25:3311

13:25:3812

13:25:4213

13:25:4414

13:25:4715

13:25:4916

13:25:5117

13:25:5518

13:26:0019

13:26:0420

13:26:0721

13:26:1322

13:26:1723

13:26:2124

13:26:2425

THE COURT: We're talking about the reservoir, not the apparatus that has all these other things. Your configured to seems awfully distinct from the word reservoir, and in fact in the patent specification when it talks about the reservoir, it says capable of.

MR. SCHARFF: Yeah, but the rest of that limitation says --

THE COURT: Tell me what the -- in ParkerVision

v. Qualcomm, where was the configured to language and what

was the -- give me the specifics of that?

MR. SCHARFF: I apologize, I don't have that.

THE COURT: How about In re Giannelli?

MR. SCHARFF: I'm sorry, I don't have the specifics of what those claim limitations were. We're just citing those for that general proposition that configured is not the same as capable of the last limitation in the '376 Patent. Yes, it's saying the apparatus is configured to, but that apparatus has to be configured to have a reservoir that receives urine. So PureWick is trying to make it sound like we're trying to turn the apparatus claim into a method claim and we're not. We're saying when you recite an apparatus claim that requires a reservoir, it has to actually be configured as a reservoir, not some structure

13:26:27 **1**13:26:32 **2** 

that hypothetically could act as a reservoir if you change the conditions or configurations or something.

13:26:34 3

Back to column 7, it says the reservoir can function as a

13:26:49 5

sump.

13:26:54 6 urine from the permeable membrane. Isn't that just talking

13:26:57 7

about it as a passageway, not as a place where it holds it?

THE COURT: Can I ask you a question, then?

The reservoir can form a portion of a passageway for

13:27:02 8

MR. SCHARFF: No, Your Honor, that reference to

13:27:03 9

the sump, that's what it's referring to, a sump is a holding

13:27:0710

and storage place for urine. Like a sump pump in your

13:27:1611

basement, it's for pumping out the sump, that collection,

13:27:2212

the aggregation area.

13:27:2713

Turn to slide 10.

13:27:3614

13:27:4015

13:27:4516

13:27:4817

13:27:518

13:27:5419

13:27:5720

13:28:0021

13:28:0422

13:28:0823

13:28:1224

13:28:1625

And then the third area in which we disagree is, and we had touched on it a little bit already, this distinction between a place versus a structure. PureWick claims that they don't think that there is any distinction, but there is, it has to do with the fact that a place is just arbitrary, unbounded. And here the patent specification claims are very clear. The specification repeatedly refers to the reservoir as a tangible structure, not just an arbitrary place inside the device with no defined boundaries. And we referenced some figures, but then again, we reference, for example, dependent claim 3 wherein the reservoir is formed of polymer. And so again,

just pointing to some arbitrary place inside a device,
that's not something that can be formed of polymer. And the
independent claim 1 has to be read consistently with that
dependent claim 3.

Next slide, please. Actually let's go to slide

Next slide, please. Actually let's go to slide 13, please.

Our construction also is consistent with the prosecution history. The Patent Office had originally rejected the claims in view of this Kuntz reference. In particular the Patent Office argued yeah, it has a reservoir because you could just call an arbitrary end of that device a reservoir because it would hold fluid at the end.

Now, next slide.

PureWick, however, argued that Kuntz did not have a reservoir. PureWick specifically told the Examiner and the public that the definition of a reservoir is a specific cavity or part that holds some fluid or secretion, and they repeatedly referred to it as something bound by structures, bound by the casing or the end cap, and yes, it includes that spacing inside of it --

THE COURT: What about the -- wasn't there some place that PureWick cited where they said something a little bit broader than that?

MR. SCHARFF: Yeah, so PureWick --

THE COURT: If you're pointing me to the

13:28:22 1 13:28:26 2 13:28:30 3 13:28:34 4 13:28:36 5 13:28:40 6 13:28:44 7 13:28:48 8 13:28:52 9 13:28:5710 13:29:0011 13:29:0312 13:29:0913 13:29:1014 13:29:1315 13:29:1616 13:29:1917 13:29:2318 13:29:2619 13:29:3120 13:29:3521 13:29:3922 13:29:4223

13:29:4424

13:29:4625

13:29:49 1 13:29:52 2 13:29:56 3 13:29:59 4 13:30:01 5 13:30:07 6 13:30:16 7 13:30:21 8 13:30:39 9 13:30:4510 13:30:4811 13:30:5112 13:30:5413 13:30:544 13:31:0015 13:31:0316 13:31:0817 13:31:1418 13:31:1719 13:31:220 13:31:2521 13:31:2922 13:31:3523

13:31:3824

13:31:4325

prosecution history, you might as well tell me why I'm supposed to look at that and say oh, they clearly limited it when they also said stuff that's broader.

MR. SCHARFF: Sure. That's not a problem. If you have Exhibit 3 in front of you, and if you go to, for example, the page that ends in PureWick 481. So we had highlighted there where PureWick had cited to the Webster's dictionary. And then let me see if you go to the top of page 482, the last sentence in that paragraph, PureWick is relying on that sentence where it says, "Accordingly when read in light of the specification, Applicant's term 'reservoir' should be read as a cavity or void space."

They say okay, that means the same thing as place. It doesn't because if you look, for example, on page 481, they're talking about it as a cavity or void space defined by some structure. They're pointing to structures in their figures. And they're describing that -- so a cavity by definition has to be defined by some structure, you can't just have a cavity in some arbitrary thin air. And so that is consistent with our construction, not consistent with the reservoir just being a place.

And then if you can turn to slide 15, please.

THE COURT: So if I were to say a reservoir is a cavity, or a space, you would be fine with that?

MR. SCHARFF: Well, for example --

13:31:44 1 THE COURT: They say Applicant's term reservoir 13:31:46 2 should be read as a cavity or void space. MR. SCHARFF: I think the rest of the context of 13:31:49 3 what they had said here, that Webster's dictionary 13:31:51 4 13:31:55 5 definition that they gave --13:31:56 6 THE COURT: You're not okay with where they say 13:31:59 7 that, you want me to go back to a different place where they say it and say it's clear they meant the one and not the 13:32:01 8 13:32:04 9 other? 13:32:0510 MR. SCHARFF: No, no, I'm saying they were saying both things at the same time. They were saying that 13:32:0711 13:32:0912 -- so in order to overcome Kuntz, they were saying it doesn't have any cavity or void space, but they're also 13:32:1213 13:32:1614 saying for it to be a reservoir, it has to be a cavity or 13:32:1915 part that holds some fluid or secretion. 13:32:2316 THE COURT: Where is the hold? Where is the 13:32:2717 hold? MR. SCHARFF: The top of page 481, where they 13:32:2818 13:32:3119 say --13:32:3120 THE COURT: Hold on. Webster's dictionary says 13:32:3421 the cavity or part that holds some fluid or secretion. get it, that's Webster's dictionary. Then when they say 13:32:3922 13:32:4323 what they want it to mean, they say it should be read as a 13:32:424 cavity or void space. 13:32:5025 MR. SCHARFF: I think those two are read

13:32:51 1 13:32:56 2 13:32:59 3 13:33:02 4 13:33:04 5 13:33:08 6 13:33:11 7 13:33:16 8 13:33:19 9 13:33:2210 13:33:2511 13:33:3012 13:33:3513 13:33:3814 13:33:4215 13:33:4416

13:33:4617 13:33:5018 13:33:5419 13:33:5520 13:33:5@1

13:34:0322

13:34:023

13:34:0724 13:34:0925

together. As I said, we would be fine with the Webster's dictionary, when they were talking about the cavity or void space, they were talking about one problem that the Kuntz reference had, they weren't defining it there. They were defining it when they said the definition of reservoir under Webster's is X.

THE COURT: I mean, so they say consistent with the dictionary meaning, the drawings of applicant's application repeatedly demonstrate that the reservoir disclosed therein is a cavity or void space within the casing. For example, Figure 32 provides a cross-sectional view of an assembly wherein the reservoir is clearly a void space between the fluid impermeable casing, the fluid permeable support, and the fluid permeable membrane. Again, not hearing any words about holding.

Similarly, figures 1 and 2 show the reservoir does not contain the permeable support or permeable membrane. The specification states the membrane can be arranged so that the fluid can flow through the permeable membrane, through the permeable support into the reservoir and out of the outlet. Again, nothing about holding in all of that.

> MR. SCHARFF: That's because --

THE COURT: I'm missing where it's like holding, holding, holding, you got to read holding in there,

13:34:13 1

but that's where I'm having a problem.

13:34:15 2

13:34:17 3

13:34:21 4

13:34:24 5

13:34:29 6

13:34:32 7

13:34:37 8

13:34:40 9

13:34:4410

13:34:4511

13:34:4812

13:34:5213

13:34:5414

13:34:5515

13:35:0016

13:35:017

13:35:0318

13:35:019

13:35:1020

13:35:1321

13:35:1622

13:35:1923

13:35:2424

13:35:2825

MR. SCHARFF: Yeah, because the issue with Kuntz is there was no dispute that it held urine, the fight was over whether or not it had a cavity or void space. They were saying Kuntz could not be a reservoir because there is no -- there is nothing in there that you can characterize as a reservoir, there is no cavity or void space, the stuffing goes all the way to the end. That's why they were focusing on the cavity or void space, but they made clear when they were referring to the figures, when they were referring to the Webster's dictionary that they were talking about it in the context of a structure and they were talking about it in the context of holding urine.

THE COURT: Are you saying this with respect to the prosecution, are you saying this is a disclaimer or al la Phillips?

MR. SCHARFF: No, Your Honor, what we're saying is the prosecution history, the intrinsic evidence informs the claim construction. The *Vitronics* case that the -- the single best reference for determining the meaning of the claims is the intrinsic evidence which is the patent itself and the prosecution history. We're not saying that this is a disclaimer, this is just informative of the construction.

Can you turn to -- sorry, we have slide 15, then.

13:35:29 1
13:35:32 2
13:35:37 3
13:35:40 4
13:35:44 5
13:35:47 6
13:35:52 7
13:35:57 8
13:36:01 9
13:36:040

13:36:0411

13:36:0612

13:36:0813

13:36:1314

13:36:1815

13:36:2216

13:36:2817

13:36:3118

13:36:3619

13:36:4120

13:36:4521

13:36:4722

13:36:5123

13:36:5424

13:36:5725

So if you also look at what PureWick's expert said in PureWick I, PureWick's expert also testified consistent with our construction. We had talked before about what our expert had said, so it's also relevant to look at what their expert said. Mr. Jezzi specifically said a reservoir is something that functions as a sump, is sized to contain a volume of liquid, and so it's not just an arbitrary place. But again, he plead it had to have this concept of holding liquid and it wasn't just an arbitrary place.

Next slide, please.

We already talked about the dictionary definition. So the next slide. So then we already touched a bit on what PureWick then said to overcome the Van Den Heuvel reference. Now, PureWick in the PureWick I case specifically said that you can see there is an orange traced structure in Van Den Heuvel. And it said that is not a reservoir because that doesn't aggregate urine. There was no dispute again that urine does channel into that space, so the argument that they made to get over it is urine doesn't aggregate there.

PureWick had pointed to some other instances in this trial where it said here in these other spots we did say things consistent with our construction. PureWick has never been able to explain or reconcile what it said about

13:37:01 1 13:37:03 2 13:37:06 3 13:37:10 4 13:37:13 5 infringement. 13:37:14 6 13:37:18 7 13:37:22 8 13:37:27 9 13:37:3310 13:37:3411 13:37:3812 13:37:4313 13:37:4714 13:37:5115 13:37:5516 13:37:5817 touched that. 13:37:5918 13:38:0119 13:38:020

13:38:0821

13:38:1222

13:38:1323

13:38:1624

13:38:1925

Van Den Heuvel and all of those other instances were in connection with their infringement allegations, it just shows that PureWick has consistently tried to take inconsistent positions with respect to invalidity and infringement.

THE COURT: What was the evidence? You keep giving me -- you keep giving me references to closing argument, which the jury was instructed is not evidence. So what was the evidence that was put on about Van Den Heuvel?

MR. SCHARFF: So that is actually one of the issues in our post-trial motions. So our expert on the stand testified that Van Den Heuvel, that area highlighted in orange is a reservoir. And then PureWick's expert didn't say anything about Van Den Heuvel. It wasn't until PureWick's counsel got up at closing and that's what he said in closing argument, even though their expert had not touched that.

THE COURT: They also cross-examined your expert and it wasn't just the reservoir that was contested, right?

MR. SCHARFF: Yes. But this was again what they said is required to be a reservoir in terms of Van Den Heuvel.

Next slide, please.

And then if you also look at what PureWick has said for purposes of infringement, they had repeatedly

13:38:23 1 13:38:27 2 13:38:31 3 13:38:34 4 13:38:38 5

13:38:42 6

13:38:43 7
13:38:48 8
13:38:51 9
13:38:51 0
13:38:571 1
13:39:01 2
13:39:03 3

13:39:0414

13:39:0715

13:39:1216

13:39:1217

13:39:2118

13:39:2419

13:39:2420

13:39:322

13:39:322

13:39:323

13:39:4325

argued that the reservoir was a structure, not just a place. They pointed to the flexible cap, for example, they pointed to the flexible cap in figures of the patent, they pointed to a cap in our product, and they said that's the reservoir, not some arbitrary place inside of it.

Next slide.

In the present lawsuit, however, PureWick has switched positions because our new device doesn't have a cap like that. There is no tangible structure that they can point to and say that's the reservoir, so instead they say the reservoir is some vague undetermined space that apparently also includes part of the stuffing.

Under the law, however, we had cited the law

Next slide, please.

that PureWick can't take such shifting positions. This is a classic case of judicial estoppel, a party can't prevail in one case by taking a position in one proceeding and taking a contrary position in the later proceeding to the prejudice of their point. We have also said collateral estoppel applies. This issue was decided. There was a final judgment. They had an opportunity to be heard and PureWick's only real comeback to this argument is they said we didn't take inconsistent positions. But again, other than them saying it they never explained how their position on Van Den Heuvel is at all consistent with their current

13:39:47 1 construction. 13:39:47 2 And that's all I have, Your Honor. 13:39:57 3 THE COURT: Thank you. Just give me a second. 13:40:35 4 Okay. You also agree that the term reservoir, fluid 13:40:43 5 reservoir should have their plain and ordinary meaning to a 13:40:45 6 POSA? 13:40:46 7 MR. BIDDINGER: Yes, Your Honor. 13:40:47 8 THE COURT: You also agree that the experts who 13:40:50 9 testified at the first trial were POSAs? 13:40:5210 MR. BIDDINGER: Yes, Your Honor. 13:40:5311 THE COURT: Tell me about the space versus place 13:40:5512 versus structure. 13:40:5613 MR. BIDDINGER: So I don't think we perceive a 13:41:0214 difference between space or place, Your Honor. We didn't intend any difference when we said place. 13:41:0615 13:41:0916 THE COURT: How about structure? 13:41:1017 MR. BIDDINGER: As we said in our brief, and I think Your Honor noted, from our perspective, this space or 13:41:1318 place is defined by a structure. There is no doubt about 13:41:1819 13:41:2320 that. 13:41:2421 THE COURT: You're saying the reservoir doesn't have to be its own structure, it can be incorporated into 13:41:2622 13:41:3023 some other structure? 13:41:3124 MR. BIDDINGER: Absolutely, Your Honor. I don't 13:41:325 think there should be any dispute about that.

13:41:34 1 13:41:38 2 13:41:43 3 13:41:47 4 13:41:50 5 13:41:53 6 13:41:58 7 13:42:03 8 13:42:06 9 13:42:0910 13:42:1211 13:42:1512 13:42:1913 13:42:2414 13:42:2715 13:42:2916 13:42:3217 13:42:3518 13:42:3719 13:42:3920 13:42:4221 13:42:4622 13:42:4923

13:42:5224

13:42:5325

specification is clear as examples in the claims show that. So our point would simply be that consistent with the way the parties treated the term in the last case, the way the experts treated the term and the way that the reservoir is designed to function, it's the space that matters. It's provided by a structure, but it's -- you know, so that's why we proposed in our footnote that if you used structure, it should be a structure or part of a structure that provides a place where urine can collect.

THE COURT: Okay. Now, what do you say about this argument that, you know, you all are changing your position. This is essentially the prior art and you want collateral estoppel so you can just be free to argue willy-nilly on infringement without having to worry about getting into the prior art?

MR. BIDDINGER: I would first say I don't see any difference in the position we're taking now versus the position we took in the last case.

THE COURT: I understand that. But he had that slide up there that showed the picture of their device, and he says you've never explained how you're taking a different -- how you're not taking a different position, how what you're saying is consistent with what you said before, so let's hear about it.

MR. BIDDINGER: Sure. So we've always proceeded

under the view that the fluid reservoir is the place where fluid can collect. We identified the place --

THE COURT: You think aggregate and collect mean the same thing?

MR. BIDDINGER: We do think they mean the same thing. We cited definitions, Your Honor pointed out their synonyms. I think our preference would have been to agree to aggregate and to cut through all this. It seems to us that they are implying something with the term aggregate that goes above and beyond what I think it means and what it's synonymous with in terms of collect and accumulate. And that goes to Your Honor's points about hold.

And as a brief aside, I want to explain this and answer Your Honor's question. But these devices are designed and we can look at the specification. Your Honor pointed right to where in the specification it talks about it, for urine to be drawn in and go out, they're not supposed to be filled up with a tube with urine, the specification teaches how simultaneous the urine can come into the reservoir and be drawn away from it. The only concern we had about aggregate is they seem to be suggesting that urine has to fill up in the device and be held there in order to infringe. And all we're saying --

THE COURT: Show me how your position now is consistent with what the position was on Van Den Heuvel.

13:42:58 1 13:43:03 2 13:43:05 3 13:43:09 4 13:43:10 5 13:43:12 6 13:43:16 7 13:43:19 8 13:43:22 9 13:43:2510 13:43:2911 13:43:3312 13:43:3613 13:43:3914 13:43:4215

13:43:4516 13:43:4717 13:43:5218

13:43:5619

13:44:0020

13:44:0321

13:44:0@2

13:44:1123 13:44:1424

13:44:1725

13:44:20 1 13:44:22 2 13:44:23 3 13:44:25 4 13:44:28 5 13:44:32 6 13:44:33 7 13:44:38 8 13:44:41 9 13:44:4310 13:44:4711 13:44:5012 13:44:5413 13:44:5914 13:45:0315 13:45:0416 13:45:0817 13:45:1018 13:45:1319 13:45:1520 13:45:121 13:45:1922 13:45:2123 claim. 13:45:224 13:45:2425

MR. BIDDINGER: Sure. Our position now on their device --

THE COURT: By the way, I recognize this isn't actually relevant to claim construction, but given that I'm trying to figure this all out, I'll ask you to help me out.

MR. BIDDINGER: Understood, Your Honor.

Counsel said that, you know, it can be anyplace, it's an arbitrary place, anyplace --

THE COURT: Under PureWick's construction,
everything related to urine collection can collect urine.

Everything relating to a urine collection device can collect
urine including the space between fabric fibers, stuffing of
the device, inside the vacuum tube or even inside the
surface of the device. Aren't those all reservoirs?

MR. BIDDINGER: Because the claim doesn't specifically say a fluid reservoir, it says a fluid reservoir is at the first end of the device, it has got to be located in a specific place. It says that the fluid permeable support is distinct from and proximate from the fluid reservoir so it's --

THE COURT: Those things might be fluid reservoirs, but they are not the fluid reservoir of the claim.

MR. BIDDINGER: Fair enough. We never said they were fluid reservoirs, but they can't be the fluid

13:45:26 1 13:45:30 2 13:45:33 3 13:45:37 4 13:45:40 5 13:45:44 6 13:45:45 7 13:45:47 8 13:45:49 9 13:45:5410 13:45:5811 13:46:0112 13:46:0613 13:46:0914 13:46:1015 13:46:1216 13:46:1517 13:46:1818 13:46:2119 13:46:2420 13:46:2721 13:46:3022

13:46:323

13:46:3724

13:46:3925

reservoirs of the claim. And it also, by the way, urine, it has to be configured, the apparatus for urine, to go through the opening in the impermeable layer, through the membrane, through the support and into the reservoir, again, tells you where it is, versus these other components, it can't just be anywhere in the device.

THE COURT: All right. So I interrupted you.

MR. BIDDINGER: Our contention, there is a space at the end, at the first end of their device where urine can collect and where urine comes in through the fabric through the support and into this space and then is drawn out of that space through the tube that extends into it. And that's our position, that's the exact same position that we took about --

THE COURT: Why are you saying that's not consistent with the position taken on Van Den Heuvel?

MR. BIDDINGER: All that we said about Van Den Heuvel at the last trial, Your Honor pointed out, we did not put an expert on it. They put an expert on it. If you look at what their expert said about it, he said almost nothing. He said there is a reservoir on this next element. And the argument was, it's a failure of proof, number one, first and foremost, that's what it was. But we didn't also say, I think counsel said --

THE COURT: Nobody said it doesn't hold it in

13:46:42 1

there.

13:46:42 2 13:46:44 3 13:46:49 4 13:46:53 5 13:46:56 6 13:47:01 7 13:47:04 8 13:47:08 9 13:47:110 13:47:1511 13:47:2212 13:47:2513 13:47:2714 13:47:3015 13:47:3016 13:47:3317 13:47:3618 13:47:4919 13:47:5320 13:47:521 13:48:0122

13:48:023

13:48:0424

13:48:0825

MR. BIDDINGER: Exactly, Your Honor. Counsel suggested that we had said that -- I just want to get it right, that we had argued that Van Den Heuvel didn't actually aggregate urine. We didn't say that in closing argument, we said that there is no reservoir where it could aggregate. It's totally consistent with our construction here. It has to have a place -- we can't say that no one had proven that there was urine in this space in Van Den Heuvel, it's a device, so the argument was in closing, it was there is no place for fluid to aggregate, and --

MR. BIDDINGER: And could accumulate in that space. He did not testify that urine could accumulate in that space.

THE COURT: Or accumulate in that space.

THE COURT: Is accumulate the same as collect?

MR. BIDDINGER: Yes, we definitely think so,

Your Honor. And then Your Honor also noted -- the other

point and Your Honor already noted this on Van Den Heuvel is

there were other grounds for the jury to find, we can't say

that Mr. Cherny's closing argument, as stirring as it was,

proved anything --

THE COURT: I recognize that with respect to the JMOL motion, but where this issue got my attention was what do I do with respect to collateral estoppel if it's possible

that we're arguing something different, so I wanted to understand what the plain and ordinary meaning is.

MR. BIDDINGER: Understood, Your Honor. have -- I think Your Honor picked up on a lot of things in your questions. Just maybe a couple of points. This is what you were looking at before, Your Honor recognized that it starts out by saying the reservoir --

THE COURT: What do you say about the argument that everything that comes after that is talking about holding it, holding a lot, holding a little, holding it temporarily, holding it for a long time, it's a sump, it's a passage, it's whatever.

MR. BIDDINGER: I think it again goes to how these devices are used. And to me the latter half of that same paragraph in the specification talks about how the urine is simultaneously removed, so it's configured to collect and hold a small or large amount while it's simultaneously removed, a temporary backup may occur.

THE COURT: You don't necessarily want the urine to pool in there, but you want to have a place to pool if it needs to as it's being sucked out.

That's right, Your Honor. MR. BIDDINGER: also where the tube extends to, there has to be this space where the urine flows down through the device into that space and sucked out with the tube from the end of that tube

13:48:14 1 13:48:18 2 13:48:21 3 13:48:28 4 13:48:31 5 13:48:37 6 13:48:39 7 13:48:42 8 13:48:44 9 13:48:4610 13:48:5011 13:48:5312 13:48:5513 13:49:0014 13:49:0715 13:49:1316

13:49:1817

13:49:2218 13:49:2519

13:49:2720

13:49:3121

13:49:3523

13:49:3422

13:49:3824

13:49:4125

13:49:45 1
13:49:49 2
13:49:54 3
13:49:57 4
13:50:00 5
13:50:04 6
13:50:08 7
13:50:12 8

13:50:16 9

13:50:2910

13:50:3211

13:50:3612

13:50:4013

13:50:4314

13:50:4815

13:50:5216

13:50:5617

13:51:0318

13:51:0619

13:51:020

13:51:1021

13:51:1622

13:51:223

13:51:2524

13:51:2825

where the urine comes down to, the spec talked about gravity or all these devices is through a vacuum, the urine flows down the device in the bottom and is drawn out through the tube. You're right, it may temporarily -- it depends on the flow rate of the urine into the device, but it never accumulate, it may go right through and be drawn out which I think is the more ideal situation because you don't want it to leak out.

I think the prosecution history got enough play. But, you know, the point of the prosecution history and the distinction that was made and what the applicants said was that the reservoir has to be this space, there has to be space. And really what it led to was the addition of that claim limitation that the permeable support is distinct from and at least proximate to the fluid reservoir. And that came from this point of saying you can't have the permeable support fill up the entire space in the device, which is what the case was.

THE COURT: How about prosecution history?

MR. BIDDINGER: Yeah, that was the point I was just talking about, Your Honor, was that the distinction that was being drawn was there has to be this space, and ultimately led to this limitation where that reservoir is separate and distinct from the permeable support and that was a distinction over Kuntz. In Kuntz, the core material

13:51:32 1
13:51:36 2
13:51:39 3
13:51:39 4
13:51:39 5
13:51:53 6

filled up the entire space. There was no space where a reservoir could be. And that's the only distinction that was being made. So it says, a cavity or void space within the casing, Applicant's term "reservoir" should be read as a cavity or void space. The point was that there was empty space.

13:51:53 7

13:51:54 8

13:51:57 9

13:52:0210

be

THE COURT: What about the definition that's offered from Webster's and then we kind of keep going back and saying so, oh, you're focusing on one part of that because that was required, but the definition from Webster's you gave included holding?

13:52:0812

13:52:1013

13:52:1314

13:52:0611

MR. BIDDINGER: I think the definition was, if you look at that entire context, was talking about the fact that a reservoir is a cavity or void space. That is the distinction that they were drawing over Kuntz. There was no discussion anywhere in the prosecution history about holding urine at all, it was all about Kuntz has filling in the entire space within the device whereas in our embodiments the reservoir is a void space, an empty space, it's distinct

13:52:1715

13:52:2116

13:52:2517

13:52:2918

13:52:319

13:52:3920

13:52:5121

13:52:5422

13:52:5923

13:53:0224

13:53:025

THE COURT: So remind me -- so I just want to make sure I understand your position on structure. Is that what you're getting to now, structure? You said something like the space or the place or formed by a structure, but it

from the permeable support.

13:53:11 1

13:53:16 2

13:53:17 3

13:53:23 4

13:53:27 5

13:53:34 6

13:53:38 7

13:53:41 8

13:53:43 9

13:53:4710

13:53:5111

13:53:5312

13:53:5713

13:54:0114

13:54:0515

13:54:0916

13:54:1417

13:54:2418

13:54:2719

13:54:3120

13:54:3521

13:54:3922

13:54:4423

13:54:4724

13:54:5025

doesn't have -- so remind me again what you said so I can --

MR. BIDDINGER: Yeah. I think, Your Honor, the point was the reservoir, the space or place provided that the reservoir provides is what matters, the functionality of the reservoir, that's where the urine can collect. We are not disputing that that is formed by a structure, it doesn't just exist in space, and I don't think -- we never argued that. I don't know where that suggestion comes from.

So all I was saying is like in our footnote, if there is a -- the Court wants to put structure into the construction of this, we would say -- I think the footnote says a structure or a part of a structure that provides a place where urine can collect. So the structure forms the space or part of a structure because it doesn't have to be a separate structure, we're all in agreement there, provides a place where urine can collect.

THE COURT: Okay.

MR. BIDDINGER: The only other points that I had, I don't know that it's worth belaboring them, but Sage keeps making this argument that right in page 1 of their brief that their construction, a structure that aggregates urine is exactly how PureWick used the term in PureWick I to avoid the prior art. That's just not true. We never said structure. And we never said that aggregates. We said there is no place for fluid to aggregate. It's consistent

with our point that it doesn't have to be actually aggregating to infringe.

13:54:54 1

13:54:56 2

13:54:58 3

13:55:01 4

13:55:05 5

13:55:08 6

13:55:08 7

13:55:13 8

13:55:19 9

13:55:2310

13:55:2711

13:55:3012

13:55:3513

13:55:3814

13:55:4115

13:55:4516

13:55:4817

13:55:5318

13:55:5619

13:56:0020

13:56:021

13:56:0922

13:56:1523

13:56:1824

13:56:2125

And the same thing is true at the PTO, they said that we told the PTO it has to be a structure that aggregates urine. Those terms weren't used in the prosecution history.

And then on judicial estoppel, counsel suggested that our only basis for saying there shouldn't be judicial estoppel is our positions weren't consistent and we disagree. We don't believe we're being inconsistent at all and Your Honor already touched on their expert saying the exact same thing as us, they said the same thing, treated it the same way in their invalidity contentions and in their expert report. And, you know, again, this is just a collection of our quotes from the prior case where our expert said it's the area, the volume where urine can accumulate, that's for infringement purposes. Empty space where urine can accumulate, that was in the closing statement, a place where urine could accumulate.

The other thing on judicial estoppel, we cited a case which was in the Third Circuit indicating that for there to even be judicial estoppel, the prior position has to have been adopted by the court. I think here it's questionable whether you can even make that determination of whether or not the jury adopted something that was said in

13:56:25 1 13:56:29 2 13:56:33 3 13:56:37 4 13:56:41 5 13:56:42 6 13:56:51 7 13:56:53 8 13:56:55 9 13:56:5710 13:56:5711 13:57:0812 13:57:1413 13:57:1914 13:57:2415 13:57:2916 13:57:3217 13:57:3718 13:57:3919 13:57:4420 13:57:4921 13:57:5322 13:57:5@3 13:58:0024

13:58:0225

closing statement in reaching its decision on the verdict.

I think there is multiple grounds and in that situation,
judicial estoppel is not appropriate.

Unless Your Honor has questions, I think that's all that I have.

THE COURT: Okay.

MR. BIDDINGER: Thank you, Your Honor.

MR. SCHARFF: May I respond, Your Honor?

THE COURT: You may.

MR. SCHARFF: Thank you.

Can I have slide 24, please.

Now, Your Honor, I never heard Mr. Biddinger explain if what is on the right is a reservoir, why isn't what is on the left in Van Den Heuvel. Now, he argued, you know, that when they were saying that Van Den Heuvel doesn't have a reservoir that that was -- that they were somehow arguing a failure to prove. No, they affirmatively said Van Den Heuvel doesn't have a reservoir and they specifically said because there is nothing about a reservoir where you aggregate urine, they didn't say, you know, that it wasn't because it couldn't aggregate or collect urine, there is nothing about can in there, and they said that there was nothing about a reservoir where you aggregate urine, they were talking about a structure.

But again, at the end of the day, I have still

13:58:06 1 13:58:09 2 13:58:13 3 13:58:17 4 13:58:21 5 13:58:25 6 13:58:30 7 13:58:31 8 13:58:34 9 13:58:3710 13:58:4111 13:58:4412 13:58:4713 13:58:5014 13:58:5315 13:58:5716 13:59:0317 13:59:048 13:59:0919 13:59:1320 13:59:121 13:59:1822 13:59:2323 13:59:2624

13:59:325

not heard any reason why that space on the left is not a reservoir and that space on the right is. And that is why their claim construction position is just fundamentally irreconcilable and why we have this issue over collateral estoppel, because if they are allowed to argue infringement for the PrimaFit 2.0, they are directly contradicting what they said in the prior art.

For example, I heard him say these devices are designed so that urine goes into the device and is pulled immediately out and it doesn't need to actually store, so why doesn't Van Den Heuvel do that? And they never explained. Our expert did, our expert testified that Van Den Heuvel does do that and there was no contrary evidence.

THE COURT: Your expert's testimony I got to say was less than compelling. All he said was yeah, there is gravity in urine pools. It was pretty conclusory.

MR. SCHARFF: Well, I mean he pointed to the Van Den Heuvel reference says urine is channeled into that end, so why doesn't that make that a reservoir, because that's exactly what they're arguing for purposes of infringement in this second case.

And if I can go to slide 15. And actually go to one slide before, please. One more before.

And then they said Kuntz, you know, really what got over Kuntz was Kuntz didn't have a cavity or void space.

13:59:36 1 13:59:39 2 13:59:44 3 13:59:44 4 13:59:49 5 13:59:55 6 14:00:00 7 14:00:03 8 14:00:06 9 14:00:0710 14:00:0911 14:00:1212 14:00:1513 14:00:1914 14:00:2215 14:00:2316 14:00:2517 14:00:2918 14:00:3319 14:00:3920 14:00:4321 14:00:5422 14:00:523 14:00:5824

14:01:0125

In the '989 Patent prosecution, the Examiner specifically said that that space 22a was, in fact, a cavity or void space.

And turn to slide 15, please. Mr. Jezzi, however, says no, that's not a reservoir because it doesn't allow free fluid to collect in there because it would get absorbed into that material around it. It's not enough to be a reservoir to have a cavity or void space, it has to be able to hold urine.

THE COURT: The problem I have is you keep telling me so he's saying. I'm not seeing it in the words, it's your interpretation of the words and that's where you're losing me because it's just like oh, and so read between the lines and this is what they're saying and I'm not getting it.

MR. SCHARFF: The third bullet point, Your Honor, this is a quote from Mr. Jezzi's expert report, paragraph 922, the Kuntz pad by nature of its design would not allow free fluid to collect into the alleged space 22a, it would be absorbed into the absorbent core material. It wasn't the fact that it didn't have a cavity or void space.

Unless Your Honor has any other questions, that's all I have.

THE COURT: Let me ask, what about the, i.e., a sump, a space holding?

14:01:09 1 14:01:11 2 14:01:12 3 14:01:15 4 14:01:17 5 14:01:23 6 14:01:28 7 14:01:31 8 14:01:36 9 14:01:4010 14:01:4311 14:01:4812 14:01:5113 14:02:0014 14:02:0415 14:02:0516 14:02:1017 14:02:2218 14:02:2719 14:02:320 14:02:3721 14:02:4322 14:02:4623

14:02:5224

14:02:5425

MR. BIDDINGER: First of all, Mr. Jezzi did not testify about this at trial.

THE COURT: I know, it's irrelevant to the jury's verdict, got it.

MR. BIDDINGER: Secondly, there were sort of multiple reasons why Kuntz did not have a reservoir. The Patent Office itself allowed the claims over it and it's because there was no space that was separate and distinct from the permeable support. That's the reason that the claims were allowed over Kuntz. That's why that limitation is in the claims, it says that permeable support has to be distinct and proximate to the fluid reservoir. And that's all that Mr. Jezzi was pointing out was that that space is not a reservoir -- I mean, the Patent Office found it was not a reservoir.

Part of the problem was that there is -- if we look at the figure from Kuntz, on their slide 13, what they were pointing to is this 22a which is where the tube that pushed into in Kuntz, but it's completely surrounded by this absorbent material, and so what Mr. Jezzi was saying was that when you have this space surrounded by this absorbent material, fluid is not going to collect in the space because the fluid is drawn into the absorbent material that is forming that space.

So I don't know what to make beyond that of

14:02:57 1
14:03:03 2
14:03:07 3
14:03:11 4
14:03:15 5

14:03:11 4

14:03:15 5

14:03:20 6

14:03:23 7

14:03:25 8

14:03:29 9

14:03:31 0

14:03:35 1

14:03:38 2

14:03:42 3

14:03:5116

14:03:4915

14:03:4614

14:03:5517 14:04:0018

14:04:0219

14:52:1220

14:52:1421

14:52:1923

14:52:1722

14:52:2324

14:52:2625

this, that's what he said, it would be absorbed into the absorbent core material. It retains fluid in that core material in contrast to the reservoir that has a space for holding free liquid. I don't think there is anything inconsistent with about that.

The other point to Van Den Heuvel, Van Den Heuvel says nothing about a reservoir. There is no disclosure anywhere in it that there is a reservoir. The only thing that they've ever pointed to is that drawing which has this little triangle at the bottom that's not described as being a space or empty space or anything. And so I don't think there is any inconsistency at all to say that Van Den Heuvel does not disclose this limitation or that they failed to prove that it disclosed this limitation in our infringement position in this case.

THE COURT: Okay. All right. Let me go back and take a look at these things and come back in about half an hour.

(A brief recess was taken.)

THE COURT: Thank you for waiting. Sorry we're a little late. Please be seated.

All right. At issue, there is one disputed claim term in two patents. These patents were previously litigated between these parties and resulted in a jury verdict of infringement and no invalidity of the claims

14:52:29 1 asserte
14:52:32 2 agreed
14:52:35 3 be give

14:52:40 5

14:52:43 6

14:52:37 4

14:52:45 7

14:52:50 8 14:52:53 9

14:52:5510

14:52:5811

14:53:012

14:53:0413

14:53:0714

14:53:1215

14:53:1616

14:53:1817

14:53:1818

14:53:2119

14:53:2320

14:53:261

14:53:2922

14:53:3423

14:53:3724

14:53:4125

asserted in that case. During that litigation, the parties agreed that the term "fluid reservoir" or "reservoir" should be given its plain and ordinary meaning. There was no dispute or disagreement about the scope of that term.

In connection with this case, Plaintiff filed a motion for judgment on the pleadings on the grounds that collateral estoppel barred certain of Defendant's defenses. As part of its response to that motion, Defendant's brief asserted that there was a claim construction issue that precluded my grant of the motion, but did not really identify what that issue was. During the argument on the 12(c) motion, Defendant asserted that Plaintiff was construing "reservoir" or "fluid reservoir" differently than it had in the prior litigation. Plaintiff disagreed. I agreed to hear this issue in an expedited manner so that I could understand the arguments and rule on the pending motion.

I am now prepared to rule on the claim construction issue. I will not be issuing a written opinion, but I will issue an order stating my rulings. I want to emphasize before I announce my decision that although I am not issuing a written opinion, we have followed a full and thorough process before making the decision I am about to state. I have reviewed the patents in dispute. I have also reviewed the record from the prior

14:53:44 1 14:53:52 2 14:53:55 3 14:53:57 4 14:54:01 5 14:54:04 6 14:54:07 7 14:54:09 8 14:54:12 9 14:54:1510 14:54:1811 14:54:2212 14:54:2413 14:54:2714 14:54:3115 14:54:3916 14:54:4417 14:54:4818 14:54:5119

14:54:520

14:54:5521

14:54:5722

14:55:0123

14:55:0424

14:55:025

litigation, PureWick Corporation v. Sage Products, LLC, C.A.

No. 19-1508-MN, which I will call "PureWick I". I have read

the parties' letters regarding claim construction and all of

the other references submitted in the many pages of

exhibits. There was full briefing on the disputed term and

argument today. All of that has been carefully considered.

As to my ruling, I am not going to read into the record my understanding of claim construction law. I have a legal standard section that I have included in earlier opinions, including my claim construction order in *PureWick*I. I incorporate that law and adopt it into my ruling today and will also set it out in the order that I issue.

The disputed term is "fluid reservoir" or "reservoir" in claims 1, 5 and 10 of the '376 Patent and claims 2, 3, 6 and 7 of the '989 Patent. Both parties argue that the term has its plain and ordinary meaning. Plaintiff proposes that meaning is "a place where urine can collect." Defendant proposes that meaning is "a structure that aggregates urine."

The dispute centers on whether there is a difference between "aggregate" and "collect," whether the term requires urine to be held in the reservoir rather than be capable of being held there and whether we need to refer to the reservoir as a structure. Here, I think the Plaintiff's statement of the plain and ordinary meaning is

14:55:10 1

14:55:14 2

14:55:16 3

14:55:19 4

14:55:28 5

14:55:31 6

14:55:35 7

14:55:35 8

14:55:38 9

14:55:4010

14:55:4411

14:55:4612

14:55:4813

14:55:5114

14:55:5615

14:55:5916

14:56:0317

14:56:0718

14:56:1119

14:56:1520

14:56:1821

14:56:2122

14:56:2423

14:56:2724

14:56:3025

the one supported by the intrinsic and extrinsic evidence and is consistent with how the claim term was used in the prior litigation. I will adopt that construction.

First, I can find no meaningful difference
between "aggregate" and "collect" in the parties'
constructions. According to Webster's New World College
Dictionary and The Chambers Dictionary, the two generally
mean the same thing. And as I pointed out during the
hearing, without objection or disagreement, looking at the
online thesaurus, the two words are synonyms.

Defendant, however, argues that there is a distinction between "aggregate" and "collect" in that "aggregate" suggests collecting and holding, while "collect" does not require actually holding of fluid. I do not, however, think that position is supported by the intrinsic evidence cited. First, the specification states that the "reservoir 110 can be any suitable shape and/or size capable of collecting fluid transported through the permeable support 140." It then goes on to give implementations and examples where the reservoir collects and holds urine - either a large amount or a small amount or does so temporarily or more permanently. It also refers to the reservoir forming part of a passageway and a sump. I do not read those subsequent statements, however, to require the reservoir to hold urine - particularly given the clear

14:56:34 1 14:56:36 2 14:56:39 3 14:56:44 4 14:56:47 5 14:56:54 6 14:56:57 7 14:57:00 8 14:57:03 9 14:57:0710 14:57:1011 14:57:1412 14:57:1713 14:57:2114 14:57:2415 14:57:2816 14:57:3217 14:57:3518

14:57:3919

14:57:4220

14:57:4621

14:57:4922

14:57:523

14:57:5524

14:57:5925

statement that the reservoir can be of any size or shape capable of collecting fluid at the beginning of the paragraph before discussing embodiments. I also can discern no reason why holding urine would be required given that the purpose of the inventions appears to be preventing urine leaking from the devices, i.e., removing it rather than holding it. I understand that the device needs to be capable of holding it when necessary, but that is different from requiring it to hold fluid when not necessary.

Second, the prosecution read as a whole does not support Defendant's position. Defendant argues that during prosecution, Plaintiff distinguished the prior art reference Kuntz from its invention to overcome the Examiner's rejection. Plaintiff argued that Kuntz does not have a reservoir, which Plaintiff defined using Webster's dictionary as "a cavity or part that holds some fluid secretion," because "the core material of Kuntz fills the entire internal space within Kuntz's backing layer 36, so there is no room for a reservoir within the casing between the permeable support and the casing." There is no further discussion of holding fluid in the subsequent arguments Indeed, Plaintiff concludes its arguments, stating made. that "when read in light of the specification, Applicant's term 'reservoir' should be read as a cavity or void space." So I think that the intrinsic evidence supports Plaintiff's

14:58:02 1 14:58:12 2 14:58:16 3 14:58:19 4 14:58:32 5 14:58:35 6 14:58:39 7 14:58:41 8 14:58:44 9 14:58:4810 14:58:5211 14:58:5812 14:59:0113 14:59:0714 14:59:1015

14:59:1216

14:59:1817

14:59:2118

14:59:2519

14:59:2920

14:59:3221

14:59:3522

14:59:3923

14:59:4324

14:59:4525

proposed construction. And the only extrinsic evidence I have from a POSA as to the meaning agrees. At his deposition in the prior case, Defendant's expert testified that he "used fluid reservoir" to mean "the same thing that anyone, any ordinary person skilled in the art would understand. It's an area where fluid can collect."

Defendant also asserts that Plaintiff is shifting its construction because in PureWick I, Plaintiff arqued that the Van Den Heuvel reference did not have a "fluid reservoir" because urine did not aggregate in the area Defendant identified as a reservoir, but is now asserting a broader construction to capture an "indeterminant 'place'" in the PrimaFit 2.0. I am not making any determination about infringement in this case, but I think that Defendant is overreading what actually happened in PureWick I. During that litigation, Plaintiff's infringement expert referred to the reservoir as "the area... the volume where urine can accumulate." As I just mentioned, Defendant's invalidity expert testified at his deposition that, to a POSA, a reservoir is "an area where fluid can collect." At trial, though, he gave rather conclusory testimony that the prior art had a reservoir. addition, Plaintiff's counsel argued during his closing in connection with infringement that the accused product had an empty space where urine can accumulate. And he argued in

14:59:49 1 14:59:53 2 14:59:56 3 14:59:59 4

15:00:01 5

15:00:05 6

15:00:08 7

15:00:11 8 15:00:14 9

15:00:1610

15:00:1911

15:00:2212

15:00:2513

15:00:2814

15:00:3115

15:00:3416

15:00:3817

15:00:4218

15:00:4719

15:00:520

15:00:521

15:00:5922

15:01:0123

15:01:0524

15:01:1025

connection with validity that Van Den Heuvel did not have a "place for fluid to aggregate." I think all of this testimony and argument from <code>PureWick</code> I is consistent with the plain and ordinary meaning as I understand it.

So I am going to construe "reservoir" and "fluid reservoir" to have the plain and ordinary meaning to a POSA, i.e., a space where fluid can collect. I am not specifically adding the word "structure" to this definition. Plaintiff agrees that the space has to be formed by something, some structure, but both parties agree that the reservoir is not required to be a separate structure. And thus, I think adding that the reservoir must be "a structure" may be confusing.

In conclusion, the intrinsic and extrinsic evidence support the plain and ordinary meaning of "reservoir" and "fluid reservoir" as "a space where urine can collect." And that is how I will construe it.

So with that, I am not going to rule on the collateral estoppel motion orally. We'll get out an opinion on that one because I think there are some other issues in it rather than just this.

And I did want to tell you all, you know, we keep track of all your discovery disputes and you have too many. So you can have this one with Judge Hall, and after that, any further requests will not be -- you will not get a

15:01:15 1 discovery hearing until lead counsel meet in person and 15:01:20 2 discuss it and report back on those discussions. All right. So that's all I had for today. 15:01:24 3 Anything else that we need to talk about while we're here? 15:01:28 4 15:01:32 5 MR. SCHARFF: Yes, Your Honor. 15:01:33 6 MR. BIDDINGER: Nothing from Plaintiff. 15:01:34 7 MR. SCHARFF: We just wanted to apprize Your 15:01:36 8 Honor of the status of discovery. We currently have a close 15:01:39 9 of discovery that's set for next week. We're in discussions 15:01:4210 with PureWick regarding an extension, partly because there is the discovery dispute being heard on the 27th, and partly 15:01:4611 15:01:5012 because there are some outstanding depositions. There was a witness that became unavailable. There are some documents 15:01:5213 we're still waiting for. We're hoping to submit something 15:01:5514 15:01:5915 to you that will be either joint or unopposed. 15:02:0216 THE COURT: It's not going to move the trial 15:02:0517 date? 15:02:048 MR. SCHARFF: Yes, we originally had a period 15:02:0819 for claim construction over the next few months we don't 15:02:1120 have to do. We have this nice empty space for the next 15:02:1421 couple of months. 15:02:122 THE COURT: All right. Thank you. 15:02:123 COURT CLERK: All rise.

24

25

(Court adjourned at 3:02 p.m.)

	23:18	addition [4] - 16:24,	31:14	45:9, 45:12
	<b>482</b> [1] - 22:9	36:13, 49:23	anyplace [6] - 4:20,	asserting [1] - 49:12
<b>'376</b> [5] <b>-</b> 3:9, 16:13,	10=[1] ==10	adjourned [1] - 51:24	6:25, 12:14, 15:5,	asserts [1] - 49:7
18:25, 19:18, 46:14	5	adopt [3] - 10:6,	32:7, 32:8	attention [1] - 34:24
<b>'989</b> [3] - 3:9, 42:1,	3	46:11, 47:3	apologize [1] - 19:13	avoid [2] - 7:10, 38:23
46:15	<b>5</b> [1] - 46:14	adopted [2] - 39:23,	apparatus [13] - 3:10,	awfully [1] - 19:5
'place' [1] - 49:13	<b>52</b> [1] - 16:15	39:25	4:11, 4:14, 12:25,	awiuliy [1] - 19.5
'reservoir' [2] - 22:12,	<b>02</b> [1] 10.10	affirmatively [1] -	18:14, 19:1, 19:4,	В
48:24	6	40:17	19:19, 19:20, 19:22,	В
40.24	0	afternoon [3] - 2:13,	19:24, 33:2	backing [1] - 48:18
,	<b>6</b> [2] <b>-</b> 9:13, 46:15	2:17, 2:23	APPEARANCES[2] -	backup [1] - 35:18
<b>'</b>		aggregate [32] - 5:19,	1:18, 2:1	barred [1] - 45:7
/s [1] - 52:3	7	5:20, 6:11, 10:3,	Applicant's [4] -	basement [1] - 20:11
10[1] 02.0		10:5, 10:7, 10:8,	22:11, 23:1, 37:4,	basis [1] - 39:8
1	<b>7</b> [4] - 16:9, 16:15,	10:13, 10:16, 10:18,	48:23	<b>became</b> [1] - 51:13
	20:4, 46:15	10:21, 10:23, 11:1,	applicant's [1] - 24:8	<b>BEFORE</b> [1] - 1:15
<b>1</b> [10] <b>-</b> 3:7, 4:9, 16:13,	<b>76</b> [1] - 13:18	26:18, 26:21, 31:3,	applicants [1] - 36:11	beginning [1] - 48:2
18:24, 18:25, 21:3,		31:8, 31:9, 31:21,	application [1] - 24:9	behalf [2] - 2:24, 3:6
24:16, 38:20, 46:14	8	34:5, 34:7, 34:11,	applies [1] - 28:20	belaboring [1] - 38:19
<b>10</b> [3] <b>-</b> 8:21, 20:13,		38:25, 40:20, 40:21,	apprize [1] - 51:7	believes [1] - 6:22
46:14	<b>8</b> [1] <b>-</b> 12:5	40:23, 46:21, 47:5,	appropriate [1] - 40:3	best [1] - 25:20
<b>11</b> [1] - 4:25	<b>844</b> [1] - 1:12	47:12, 47:13, 49:10,	arbitrary [13] - 5:22,	<b>better</b> [1] - 9:10
<b>110</b> [5] - 11:12, 15:4,		50:2	6:24, 9:2, 9:22,	between [17] - 5:24,
15:13, 15:15, 47:17	9	aggregates [7] - 4:21,	20:19, 20:22, 21:1,	7:4, 9:18, 10:1, 10:3,
<b>12</b> [3] - 5:6, 16:3, 18:5		6:15, 12:9, 38:21,	21:11, 22:19, 26:8,	12:8, 12:15, 20:16,
<b>12(c</b> [1] - 45:12	<b>9</b> [1] - 18:7	38:24, 39:5, 46:19	26:9, 28:5, 32:8	24:13, 29:14, 32:12,
<b>13</b> [2] - 21:6, 43:17	<b>922</b> [1] <b>-</b> 42:18	aggregating [2] -	area [10] - 9:23, 13:14,	42:14, 44:24, 46:21,
<b>14</b> [1] - 5:10		18:11, 39:2	14:4, 20:12, 20:14,	47:5, 47:12, 48:19
<b>140</b> [1] - 47:19	Α	aggregation [1] -	27:12, 39:16, 49:6,	beyond [2] - 31:10,
<b>15</b> [4] - 22:22, 25:24,	ahla m. 20:05 40:0	20:12	49:11, 49:20	43:25
41:22, 42:4	<b>able</b> [2] - 26:25, 42:9	agree [7] - 6:1, 7:24,	area [1] - 49:18	BIDDINGER [29] -
<b>16</b> [1] - 17:22	absolutely [2] - 15:12,	8:25, 29:4, 29:8,	areas [1] - 5:18	1:22, 29:7, 29:10,
<b>17</b> [1] - 1:10	29:24	31:7, 50:10	argue [3] - 30:13,	29:13, 29:17, 29:24,
<b>19-1508-MN</b> [1] - 46:2	absorbed [3] - 42:7,	agreed [2] - 45:2,	41:5, 46:15	30:16, 30:25, 31:5,
<b>1:00</b> [1] - 1:10	42:20, 44:1	45:15	argued [12] - 6:8, 6:9,	32:1, 32:6, 32:15,
	absorbent [5] - 42:20,	agreeing [1] - 14:23	21:10, 21:14, 28:1,	32:24, 33:8, 33:17,
2	43:20, 43:21, 43:23, 44:2	agreement [2] - 10:6,	34:4, 38:7, 40:14,	34:2, 34:13, 34:17,
		38:15	48:14, 49:9, 49:23,	35:3, 35:13, 35:22,
<b>2</b> [2] - 24:16, 46:15	<b>Acco</b> [2] - 12:21, 12:23	agrees [3] - 7:16,	49:25	36:20, 37:12, 38:2,
<b>2.0</b> [2] - 41:6, 49:13	according [2] - 15:23,	49:2, 50:9	argues [2] - 47:11,	38:18, 40:7, 43:1,
<b>2023</b> [1] - 1:10	47:6	air [1] - 22:19	48:11	43:5, 51:6
<b>22-102(MN</b> [1] - 1:5	accordingly [1] - 7:21	<b>al</b> [1] - 25:15	arguing [4] - 6:13,	Biddinger [2] - 2:19,
<b>22a</b> [3] - 42:2, 42:19,	Accordingly [1] - 7.21	allegations [1] - 27:2	35:1, 40:17, 41:20	40:12
43:18	22:10	alleged [2] - 6:13,	argument [15] - 12:22,	<b>big</b> [2] - 17:24, 18:9
<b>24</b> [1] - 40:11	accumulate [12] -	42:19	26:20, 27:8, 27:16,	bigger [1] - 12:6
27th [1] - 51:11	10:21, 31:11, 34:12,	<b>allow</b> [2] - 42:6, 42:19	28:22, 30:11, 33:22,	<b>bit</b> [5] - 11:8, 17:16,
	34:13, 34:14, 34:16,	allowed [3] - 41:5,	34:6, 34:10, 34:21,	20:15, 21:23, 26:14
3	36:6, 39:17, 39:18,	43:7, 43:10	35:8, 38:20, 45:11,	<b>bottom</b> [4] - 9:4, 9:17,
	39:19, 49:18, 49:25	almost [1] - 33:20	46:6, 50:3	36:3, 44:10
<b>3</b> [9] <b>-</b> 5:4, 5:16, 16:7,	accurate [2] - 7:22,	alone [2] - 4:9, 11:9	arguments [3] - 45:16,	<b>bound</b> [2] - 21:18,
16:9, 16:11, 20:24,	52:1	alternative [1] - 17:3	48:21, 48:22	21:19
21:4, 22:5, 46:15	accused [4] - 6:22,	amass [1] - 10:21	arranged [1] - 24:19	<b>boundaries</b> [1] - 20:23
<b>32</b> [1] - 24:11	9:7, 12:19, 49:24	ambiguous [1] - 14:6	<b>arrow</b> [1] - 9:21	boundary [1] - 14:1
<b>36</b> [1] - 48:18	act [1] - 20:1	amount [6] - 17:6,	<b>art</b> [11] - 4:1, 4:5,	bounded [2] - 8:24,
<b>38</b> [1] - 16:15	actual [2] - 6:22, 12:19	17:19, 35:17, 47:21	13:14, 14:4, 30:12,	11:10
<b>3:02</b> [1] - 51:24	actuality [1] - 18:8	amounts [1] - 16:20	30:15, 38:23, 41:7,	Brands [1] - 12:21
4	add [1] - 10:21	<b>ANNE</b> [1] - 2:3	48:12, 49:5, 49:22	BRIAN [1] - 1:22
4	adding [2] - 50:8,	<b>Anne</b> [1] - 2:23	aside [1] - 31:13	Brian [1] - 2:19
494 m 20/0 20/45	50:12	announce [1] - 45:21	<b>assembly</b> [1] - 24:12	brief [15] - 4:23, 6:16,
<b>481</b> [3] <b>-</b> 22:6, 22:15,	30	answer [2] - 6:18,	asserted [3] - 45:1,	7:13, 9:16, 10:4,

10:14, 16:9, 18:13, 18:20, 29:17, 31:13, 38:21, 44:19, 45:8 briefing [1] - 46:5 broad [2] - 16:16, 16:23 broader [3] - 21:23, 22:3, 49:12 bullet [1] - 42:16 BY [6] - 1:20, 1:22, 1:23, 2:6, 2:6, 2:7

## C

C.A [2] - 1:5, 46:1 cap [5] - 21:19, 28:2, 28:3, 28:4, 28:8 capability [1] - 18:8 capable [18] - 5:15, 11:12, 12:12, 12:20, 13:3, 15:6, 16:17, 17:11, 17:13, 18:10, 18:17, 18:22, 19:7, 19:18, 46:23, 47:17, 48:2, 48:8 capture [1] - 49:12 car [2] - 15:8, 15:9 carefully [1] - 46:6 case [20] - 12:17, 12:21, 13:6, 13:7, 13:10, 25:19, 26:15, 28:16, 28:17, 30:3, 30:18, 36:18, 39:15, 39:21, 41:21, 44:15, 45:1, 45:5, 49:3, 49:14 casing [14] - 4:10, 7:18, 8:4, 8:5, 8:10, 9:18, 13:11, 13:25, 21:19, 24:11, 24:13, 37:4, 48:19, 48:20 cavity [28] - 5:14, 8:14, 8:23, 21:17, 22:12, 22:15, 22:18, 22:19, 22:24, 23:2, 23:13, 23:14, 23:21, 23:24, 24:2, 24:10, 25:4, 25:7, 25:9, 37:3, 37:5, 37:14, 41:25, 42:2, 42:8, 42:21, 48:16, 48:24 centers [1] - 46:20 certain [1] - 45:7 certify [1] - 52:1 Chambers [1] - 47:7 change [1] - 20:1 changing [1] - 30:11 channel [1] - 26:19 channeled [2] - 6:12, 41:18

characterization [1] -14.22 characterize [1] - 25:6 Cherny [1] - 2:19 Cherny's [1] - 34:21 CHRISTOPHER [1] -2:6 Christopher [2] - 2:25, Circuit [2] - 18:15, 39:21 cited [9] - 10:12, 12:17, 13:17, 21:22, 22:7, 28:14, 31:6, 39:20, 47:16 citing [2] - 18:19, 19:17 claim [37] - 3:15, 4:9, 5:3, 6:6, 6:17, 9:15, 9:16, 9:24, 10:2, 12:18, 12:25, 18:23, 18:24, 18:25, 19:16, 19:22, 19:23, 19:24, 20:24, 21:3, 21:4, 25:19, 32:4, 32:15, 32:23, 33:1, 36:14, 41:3, 44:23, 45:9, 45:18, 46:3, 46:8, 46:10, 47:2, 51:19 claiming [1] - 9:19 claims [19] - 3:16, 4:9, 5:1, 5:24, 12:10, 12:23, 15:11, 18:14, 20:17, 20:20, 21:9, 25:21, 30:1, 43:7, 43:10, 43:11, 44:25, 46:14, 46:15 clarify [1] - 11:9 classic [1] - 28:16 clear [8] - 9:9, 11:17, 15:17, 20:20, 23:8, 25:9, 30:1, 47:25 clearly [2] - 22:2, 24:12 CLERK [1] - 51:23 close [1] - 51:8 closing [9] - 27:7, 27:15, 27:16, 34:5, 34:10, 34:21, 39:18, 40:1, 49:23 collateral [6] - 28:19, 30:13, 34:25, 41:4, 45:7, 50:19 colleague [1] - 3:2 collect [56] - 4:20, 5:18, 5:20, 7:1, 7:4, 7:6, 7:24, 10:3, 10:8, 10:16, 10:18, 10:19, 10:21, 10:22, 11:3, 12:2, 12:14, 13:15,

14:5, 14:11, 14:12, 15:16, 16:21, 17:8, 17:15, 17:24, 18:3, 18:4, 30:9, 31:2, 31:3, 31:11, 32:10, 32:11, 33:10, 34:16, 35:17, 38:5, 38:13, 38:16, 40:21, 42:6, 42:19, 43:22, 46:17, 46:21, 47:5, 47:12, 47:13, 49:6, 49:21, 50:7, 50:17 collecting [20] - 5:8, 10:11, 11:2, 11:4, 11:13, 11:14, 11:15, 11:18, 11:25, 12:1, 15:6, 16:5, 16:18, 17:11, 17:14, 18:10, 47:13, 47:18, 48:2 collection [5] - 7:1, 20:11, 32:10, 32:11, 39:15 collects [3] - 11:21, 15:5, 47:20 College [1] - 47:6 column [3] - 16:9, 16:15, 20:4 combine [1] - 10:22 comeback [1] - 28:22 coming [1] - 18:8 **compelling** [1] - 41:15 competitors [1] - 7:9 completely [1] - 43:19 components [1] - 33:5 Conaway [1] - 2:24 CONAWAY [1] - 2:2 concede [1] - 12:8 concept [2] - 11:4, 26.9 concern [1] - 31:21 concludes [1] - 48:22 conclusion [1] - 50:14 conclusory [2] -41:16, 49:22 **conditions** [1] - 20:2 configurations [1] -20:2 configured [19] - 4:15, 5:21, 13:4, 17:20, 18:12, 18:14, 18:16, 18:22, 18:25, 19:1, 19:5, 19:11, 19:17, 19:19, 19:20, 19:25, 33:2, 35:16 confusing [1] - 50:13 connection [5] -15:25, 27:2, 45:5, 49:24, 50:1 considered [1] - 46:6 consistent [17] -

47:2, 50:3 consistently [3] -18:2, 21:3, 27:3 constructed [1] -18:18 construction [45] -4:19, 4:21, 4:24, 5:2, 6:2, 6:4, 6:6, 6:7, 6:17, 6:24, 7:3, 7:7, 7:22, 7:24, 8:11, 8:22, 9:16, 10:2, 10:5, 11:22, 11:23, 12:13, 21:7, 22:20, 25:19, 25:23, 26:3, 26:24, 29:1, 32:4, 32:9, 34:7, 38:11, 38:21, 41:3, 45:9, 45:19, 46:3, 46:8, 46:10, 47:3, 49:1, 49:8, 49:12, 51:19 constructions [3] -4:18, 5:25, 47:6 construe [4] - 3:13, 13:22, 50:5, 50:17 construed [1] - 13:7 construing [2] -18:20, 45:13 contain [2] - 24:17, 26:7 contention [1] - 33:8 contentions [1] -39:13 contested [1] - 27:19 context [6] - 6:5, 16:7, 23:3, 25:12, 25:13, 37:13 **CONTINUED** [1] - 2:1 contradicting [1] -41:6 contradiction [1] -6:18 contrary [2] - 28:18, 41:13 contrast [1] - 44:3 core [5] - 36:25, 42:20, 44:2, 48:17 Corporation [1] - 46:1 CORPORATION[1] correct [2] - 7:18, 7:19 Counsel [2] - 1:24, 2:8 counsel [7] - 27:15, 32:7, 33:24, 34:2, 39:7, 49:23, 51:1 couple [2] - 35:5,

15:22, 21:7, 22:20,

26:24, 28:25, 30:2,

30:23, 31:25, 33:16,

22:21, 24:7, 26:3,

34:7, 38:25, 39:9,

51:21 court [3] - 13:21, 39:23 COURT [89] - 1:1, 2:13, 2:22, 3:3, 3:17, 3:19, 3:22, 3:25, 4:3, 4:7, 7:12, 7:15, 7:21, 8:3, 8:17, 9:9, 9:12, 10:20, 11:6, 11:11, 11:24, 13:9, 13:19, 14:2, 14:8, 14:17, 14:19, 15:3, 15:10, 15:13, 15:15, 15:21, 16:6, 16:11, 16:14, 17:9, 17:13, 18:19, 19:3, 19:10, 19:14, 20:3, 21:21, 21:25, 22:23, 23:1, 23:6, 23:16, 23:20, 24:7, 24:24, 25:14, 27:6, 27:18, 29:3, 29:8, 29:11, 29:16, 29:21, 30:10, 30:19, 31:3, 31:24, 32:3, 32:9, 32:21, 33:7, 33:15, 33:25, 34:12, 34:16, 34:23, 35:8, 35:19, 36:19, 37:7, 37:22, 38:17, 40:6, 40:9, 41:14, 42:10, 42:24, 43:3, 44:16, 44:20, 51:16, 51:22, 51:23 Court [5] - 1:15, 38:10, 51:24, 52:3, 52:4 covered [1] - 15:11 cross [2] - 24:11, 27:18 cross-examined [1] -27:18 cross-sectional [1] -24:11 current [2] - 6:21, 28:25 cut [1] - 31:8

## D

Dale [1] - 52:3 date [1] - 51:17 decided [1] - 28:20 decision [3] - 40:1, 45:21, 45:24 Defendant [11] - 1:8, 2:8, 2:24, 3:6, 45:12, 46:18, 47:11, 48:11, 49:7, 49:11, 49:15 Defendant's [6] - 16:1, 45:7, 45:8, 48:11, 49:3, 49:19

defenses [1] - 45:7 defined [6] - 13:25, 20:23, 22:16, 22:18, 29:19, 48:15 defining [5] - 8:10, 11:15, 15:15, 24:4, 24:5 **definitely** [1] - 34:17 definition [20] - 5:13, 10:15, 10:18, 11:1, 13:10, 14:14, 14:24, 15:9, 15:20, 15:21, 21:16, 22:18, 23:5, 24:5, 26:13, 37:7, 37:10, 37:12, 50:8 definitions [3] - 10:17, 18:2, 31:6 **DELAWARE**[1] - 1:2 Delaware [2] - 1:13, 13:7 demonstrate [1] - 24:9 Den [27] - 6:9, 10:14, 26:14, 26:17, 27:1, 27:9, 27:12, 27:14, 27:21, 28:25, 31:25, 33:16, 33:17, 34:4, 34:9, 34:19, 40:14, 40:15, 40:18, 41:11, 41:13, 41:18, 44:6, 44:13, 49:9, 50:1 dependent [2] - 20:24, 21:4 deposition [3] - 13:10, 49:3, 49:20 depositions [1] -51:12 described [1] - 44:11 describing [4] - 17:4, 17:7, 17:23, 22:17 description [1] - 15:7 design [1] - 42:18 designed [4] - 18:18, 30:5, 31:15, 41:9 determination [2] -39:24, 49:14 determining [1] -25:20 device [27] - 5:23, 6:14, 7:1, 7:6, 9:18, 12:3, 20:22, 21:1, 21:11, 28:8, 30:20, 31:22, 32:2, 32:11, 32:13, 32:14, 32:17, 33:6, 33:9, 34:10, 35:24, 36:3, 36:5, 36:17, 37:18, 41:9, 48:7 devices [6] - 12:15, 31:14, 35:14, 36:2, 41:8, 48:6

22:8, 23:4, 23:20, 23:22, 24:2, 24:8, 25:11, 26:12, 48:16 **Dictionary** [2] - 47:7 difference [9] - 10:3, 12:7, 12:8, 29:14, 29:15, 30:17, 46:21, 47:4 differences [4] - 4:22, 5:24, 6:2, 10:1 different [7] - 6:7, 6:8, 23:7, 30:21, 30:22, 35:1, 48:8 differently [1] - 45:13 directed [1] - 3:10 directly [1] - 41:6 disagree [2] - 20:14, 39:10 disagreed [1] - 45:14 disagreement [4] -4:17, 5:17, 45:4, 47:9 discern [1] - 48:3 discharged [1] - 3:11 disclaimer [2] - 25:15, 25:23 disclose [1] - 44:13 disclosed [2] - 24:10, 44:14 disclosure [1] - 44:8 discovery [5] - 50:23, 51:1, 51:8, 51:9, 51:11 discuss [2] - 5:11, 51:2 discussing [1] - 48:3 discussion [2] -37:16, 48:21 discussions [2] -51:2, 51:9 disposed [1] - 4:13 dispute [9] - 12:6, 25:3, 26:19, 29:25, 45:4, 45:25, 46:20, 51:11 disputed [3] - 44:22, 46:5, 46:13 disputes [1] - 50:23 disputing [4] - 6:5, 6:6, 6:20, 38:6 distinct [8] - 4:12, 19:5, 32:19, 36:14, 36:24, 37:19, 43:8, 43:12 distinction [8] - 20:16, 20:17, 36:11, 36:21, 36:25, 37:2, 37:15,

dictionaries [1] -

dictionary [10] - 18:2,

10.12

47:12 distinguish [1] - 12:22 distinguished [1] -48:12 **DISTRICT** [2] - 1:1, 1:2 District [3] - 1:15, 13:6, 52:4 documents [1] - 51:13 doubt [1] - 29:19 down [3] - 35:24, 36:1, 36:3 drawing [3] - 12:1, 37:15, 44:9 drawings [1] - 24:8 drawn [7] - 31:17, 31:20, 33:11, 36:3, 36:6, 36:22, 43:23 during [6] - 45:1, 45:11, 47:8, 48:11, 49:16, 49:23

# Ε

either [3] - 17:4. 47:21, 51:15 element [1] - 33:21 **EMANUEL**[1] - 1:22 **Emanuel** [1] - 2:19 embodiments [3] -17:3, 37:18, 48:3 emphasize [1] - 45:21 empty [6] - 37:5, 37:19, 39:17, 44:11, 49:25, 51:20 end [19] - 4:11, 4:13, 6:14, 8:9, 13:12, 13:24, 18:24, 21:11, 21:12, 21:19, 25:8, 32:17, 33:9, 35:25, 40:25, 41:18 ends [1] - 22:6 entire [6] - 8:5, 36:17, 37:1, 37:13, 37:18, 48:18 ESQ [8] - 1:20, 1:22, 1:23, 2:3, 2:3, 2:6, 2:6, 2:7 **essentially** [1] - 30:12 estoppel [12] - 28:16, 28:19, 30:13, 34:25, 39:7, 39:9, 39:20, 39:22, 40:3, 41:5, 45:7, 50:19 **Europe** [1] - 2:20 everywhere[1] - 8:22 evidence [15] - 4:23, 14:25, 15:1, 15:2, 25:18, 25:21, 27:6, 27:8, 27:9, 41:13,

47:1, 47:16, 48:25,

exactly [5] - 3:24, 9:14, 34:2, 38:22, 41:20 examined [1] - 27:18 Examiner [2] - 21:15, 42:1 **Examiner's** [1] - 48:13 example [17] - 3:16, 4:9, 5:2, 5:3, 10:10, 15:8, 17:15, 18:4, 18:24, 20:24, 22:6, 22:14, 22:25, 24:11, 28:2, 41:8 examples [2] - 30:1, 47:20 Exhibit [6] - 16:7, 16:9, 16:11, 16:13, 22:5 exhibits [1] - 46:5 exist [1] - 38:7 **expedited** [1] - 45:15 expert [22] - 15:23, 16:1, 26:1, 26:2, 26:4, 26:5, 27:11, 27:13, 27:16, 27:18, 33:19, 33:20, 39:11, 39:14, 39:16, 41:12, 42:17, 49:3, 49:17, 49:19 expert's [2] - 13:9, 41:14 experts [3] - 15:2, 29:8, 30:4 explain [6] - 5:1, 5:7, 6:2, 26:25, 31:13, 40:13 explained [3] - 28:24, 30:21, 41:12 expressly [2] - 9:16, 9:19 extends [2] - 33:12, 35:23 extension [1] - 51:10 extrinsic [4] - 15:2, 47:1, 49:1, 50:14 F

49:1, 50:15

39:12

exact [2] - 33:13,

fabric [2] - 32:12, 33:10 fact [6] - 6:3, 19:6, 20:18, 37:13, 42:2, 42:21 failed [1] - 44:14 failure [2] - 33:22, 40:17 fair [1] - 32:24 February [1] - 1:10 Federal [1] - 18:15 **FELICE** [1] - 1:23 Felice [1] - 2:19 few [1] - 51:19 fibers [3] - 7:5, 12:15, 32.12 fight [1] - 25:3 fighting [1] - 18:9 figure [2] - 32:5, 43:17 Figure [1] - 24:11 figures [5] - 20:23, 22:17, 24:16, 25:10, 28:3 filed [1] - 45:5 fill [2] - 31:22, 36:17 filled [2] - 31:18, 37:1 filling [1] - 37:17 fills [1] - 48:17 final [1] - 28:20 fine [4] - 8:21, 10:4, 22:24, 24:1 first [21] - 3:4, 4:4, 4:11, 5:18, 6:6, 9:3, 10:2, 13:11, 13:24, 17:9, 17:10, 29:9, 30:16, 32:17, 33:9, 33:22, 43:1, 47:4, 47:16 flexible [2] - 28:2, 28:3 flow [2] - 24:19, 36:5 flows [2] - 35:24, 36:2 fluid [67] - 3:14, 4:10, 4:12, 5:9, 5:14, 7:24, 11:13, 12:2, 13:11, 13:12, 13:15, 13:20, 13:23, 14:2, 14:5, 15:6, 16:18, 17:11, 21:12, 21:17, 23:15, 23:21, 24:13, 24:14, 24:19, 29:4, 31:1, 31:2, 32:16, 32:18, 32:20, 32:21, 32:22, 32:25, 34:11, 36:15, 38:25, 42:6, 42:19, 43:12, 43:22, 43:23, 44:2. 45:2. 45:13. 46:13, 47:14, 47:18, 48:2, 48:9, 48:16, 48:21, 49:4, 49:6, 49:10, 49:21, 50:2, 50:5, 50:7, 50:16 fluids [1] - 15:16 focusing [2] - 25:8, 37:9 followed [2] - 15:1, 45:23

footnote [3] - 30:7,

38:9, 38:11

FOR [1] - 1:2

foregoing [1] - 52:1 foremost [1] - 33:23 **form** [1] - 20:5  $\textbf{formed} \ [8] \ \textbf{-} \ 5{:}4, \ 5{:}5,$ 7:18, 20:25, 21:2, 37:25, 38:6, 50:9 forming [2] - 43:24, 47:23 forms [1] - 38:13 free [4] - 30:13, 42:6, 42:19, 44:4 Friday [1] - 1:10 front [2] - 13:17, 22:5 fuel [1] - 13:7 full [2] - 45:23, 46:5 function [2] - 20:4, 30:5 functionality [1] - 38:4 **functions** [1] - 26:6 fundamentally [1] -41:3

# G

gather [1] - 10:19 gathering [1] - 11:2 GAZA [2] - 2:3, 2:23 Gaza [2] - 2:22, 2:24 general [1] - 19:17 generally [1] - 47:7 Giannelli [1] - 19:14 given [4] - 32:4, 45:3, 47:25, 48:4 grant [1] - 45:10 gravity [2] - 36:1, 41:16 great [1] - 3:3 grounds [3] - 34:20, 40:2. 45:6 guess [1] - 16:14

## Н

half [2] - 35:14, 44:17 Hall [1] - 50:24 Hawkins [1] - 52:3 heaped [1] - 10:22 hear [2] - 30:24, 45:15 heard [5] - 28:21, 40:12, 41:1, 41:8, 51:11 hearing [3] - 24:15, 47:9, 51:1 Hearing [1] - 1:11 held [5] - 12:4, 25:3, 31:22, 46:22, 46:23 **HELD**[1] - 2:5 Held [1] - 3:1 help [4] - 7:8, 7:9, 17:21, 32:5

helps [1] - 6:4 hereby [1] - 52:1 Heuvel [27] - 6:10, 10:14, 26:15, 26:17, 27:1, 27:9, 27:12, 27:14, 27:22, 28:25, 31:25, 33:16, 33:18, 34:4, 34:10, 34:19, 40:14, 40:15, 40:18, 41:11, 41:13, 41:18, 44:6, 44:7, 44:13, 49:9, 50:1 highlighted [2] - 22:7, 27:12 history [12] - 5:12, 8:14, 8:23, 21:8,

nistory [12] - 5:12, 8:14, 8:23, 21:8, 22:1, 25:18, 25:22, 36:9, 36:10, 36:19, 37:16, 39:6 hold [24] - 5:9, 7:12, 11:24, 16:6, 16:19, 16:20, 16:21, 16:22, 17:4, 17:5, 17:6, 17:18, 17:20, 21:12, 23:16, 23:17, 23:20, 31:12, 33:25, 35:17, 42:9, 47:25, 48:9 holding [32] - 10:12, 11:4, 11:5, 11:14,

24:24, 24:25, 25:13, 26:9, 35:10, 35:11, 37:11, 37:16, 42:25, 44:4, 47:13, 47:14, 48:4, 48:7, 48:8, 48:21

holds [11] - 5:14, 8:14, 11:21, 12:17, 17:17, 20:7, 21:17, 23:15, 23:21, 47:20, 48:16

11:16, 11:18, 16:5,

20:9, 24:15, 24:21,

23:21, 47:20, 48:16
hole [2] - 10:19, 11:3
Honor [44] - 2:17,
2:23, 3:6, 3:8, 3:18,
3:24, 4:6, 9:11, 11:7,
11:17, 14:21, 18:5,
18:24, 20:8, 25:17,
29:2, 29:7, 29:10,
29:14, 29:18, 29:24,
31:6, 31:15, 32:6,
33:18, 34:2, 34:18,
34:19, 35:3, 35:4,
35:6, 35:22, 36:21,
38:2, 39:11, 40:4,
40:7, 40:8, 40:12,
42:17, 42:22, 51:5,

51:8 **Honor's** [2] - 31:12, 31:14

HONORABLE [1] -

1:15 hoping [1] - 51:14 hour [1] - 44:18 hypothetically [3] -5:20, 12:11, 20:1

#### -1

I" [1] - 46:2 i.e [3] - 42:24, 48:6, 50:7 ideal [1] - 36:7 identifiable [1] - 5:23 identified [3] - 6:21, 31:2, 49:11 identify [1] - 45:11 ignore [1] - 17:1 II [1] - 6:13 immediately [2] -12:3, 41:10 impermeable [3] -4:10, 24:13, 33:3 implementations [7] -16:19, 16:20, 17:14, 17:16, 17:18, 17:19, 47:19 implying [1] - 31:9 **important** [1] - 15:1 importantly [1] - 4:14 IN [1] - 1:1 inch [1] - 9:3 include [1] - 7:4 included [2] - 37:11, 46.9 includes [3] - 9:20, 21:20, 28:12 including [3] - 9:22, 32:12, 46:10 inconsistency [1] -44:12 inconsistent [8] -6:16, 14:14, 14:15, 14:20, 27:4, 28:23, 39:10, 44:5 incorporate [1] -46:11 incorporated [1] -29:22 incorrect [1] - 12:24 indeed [1] - 48:22 independent [1] - 21:3 indeterminant [1] -49:13 indicating [1] - 39:21 inexplicable [1] informative [1] - 25:23 informs [1] - 25:18 infringe [3] - 12:18, 31:23, 39:2

39:17, 41:5, 41:20, 44:15, 44:25, 49:14, 49:17, 49:24 inside [7] - 9:1, 20:22, 21:1, 21:20, 28:5, 32:13 instances [3] - 16:4. 26:22, 27:1 instead [1] - 28:10 instructed [1] - 27:8 integrally [1] - 7:18 integrated [2] - 8:3, 8:4 intend [1] - 29:15 internal [1] - 48:18 interpretation [1] -42:12 interrupted [1] - 33:7 intrinsic [9] - 4:23, 14:25, 25:18, 25:21, 47:1, 47:15, 48:25, 50:14 introductions [1] -2:15 invalidity [4] - 27:4, 39:13, 44:25, 49:19 invention [1] - 48:13 inventions [1] - 48:5 involved [2] - 12:23, 12:24 irreconcilable [2] -6:18, 41:4 irrelevant [1] - 43:3 issue [18] - 7:7, 8:2, 8:11, 8:16, 8:21, 11:8, 18:8, 25:2, 28:20, 34:24, 41:4, 44:22, 45:9, 45:11, 45:15, 45:19, 45:20, 46:12 issues [2] - 27:11, 50:20 issuing [2] - 45:19,

infringement [14] -

7:10, 13:5, 27:2,

27:5, 27:25, 30:14,

# itself [2] - 25:21, 43:7

45:22

jagged [1] - 9:5 Jezzi [5] - 26:5, 42:4, 43:1, 43:13, 43:20 Jezzi's [1] - 42:17 JMOL [1] - 34:24 JOHN [1] - 1:20 John [1] - 2:17 joined [1] - 2:25 joining [1] - 2:18 joint [1] - 51:15 Judge [2] - 1:15, 50:24 judgment [2] - 28:21, 45:6 judicial [6] - 28:16, 39:7, 39:8, 39:20, 39:22, 40:3 jury [6] - 7:8, 9:6, 27:8, 34:20, 39:25, 44:24 jury's [1] - 43:4

## Κ

keep [5] - 27:6, 27:7, 37:8, 42:10, 50:23 keeps [1] - 38:20 **KELLER** [1] - 1:19 kept [1] - 18:4 kind [1] - 37:8 King [1] - 1:12 knows [1] - 3:8 Kuntz [21] - 21:9, 21:14, 23:12, 24:3, 25:2, 25:5, 36:25, 37:15, 37:17, 41:24, 41:25, 42:18, 43:6, 43:10, 43:17, 43:19, 48:13, 48:14, 48:17 Kuntz's [1] - 48:18

#### L

language [2] - 18:16, 19.11 large [5] - 16:20, 17:5, 17:19, 35:17, 47:21 last [7] - 16:25, 19:1, 19:18, 22:9, 30:3, 30:18, 33:18 late [1] - 44:21 latter [1] - 35:14 law [5] - 12:17, 28:14, 46:8. 46:11 lawsuit [3] - 3:9, 6:21, 28:7 layer [2] - 33:3, 48:18 lead [1] - 51:1 leak [1] - 36:8 leaking [1] - 48:6 least [1] - 36:15 led [2] - 36:13, 36:23 left [3] - 9:15, 40:14, 41:1 legal [1] - 46:9 less [1] - 41:15 letters [1] - 46:3 light [2] - 22:11, 48:23 **limitation** [8] - 19:1,

19:9, 19:18, 36:14,

21:10

36:23, 43:10, 44:13, 44:14 limitations [2] - 9:24, 19:16 limited [1] - 22:2 line [1] - 9:5 lines [2] - 16:15, 42:14 liquid [4] - 18:3, 26:7, 26:9, 44:4 listed [1] - 10:22 literally [2] - 6:25, 12:14 litigated [1] - 44:24 litigation [5] - 45:1. 45:14. 46:1. 47:3. 49:16 **LLC** [2] - 1:7, 46:1 LLP [2] - 1:19, 2:2 located [1] - 32:18 lock [1] - 13:2 locking [1] - 13:2 look [15] - 9:20, 10:14, 10:16, 18:1, 18:6, 22:2, 22:14, 26:1, 26:5, 27:24, 31:15, 33:19, 37:13, 43:17, 44:17 looked [1] - 10:20 looking [3] - 18:21, 35:6, 47:9

# М

losing [1] - 42:13

main [1] - 8:10 MALLOY [1] - 2:5 Malloy [1] - 3:1 manner [1] - 45:15 Markman [1] - 1:11 MARYELLEN[1] mass [2] - 10:19, 11:2 material [9] - 36:25, 42:7, 42:20, 43:20, 43:22, 43:23, 44:2, 44:3, 48:17 matters [2] - 30:5, 38:4 McAndrew [1] - 3:1 McANDREWS [1] - 2:5 mean [19] - 8:17, 10:8, 13:13, 14:3, 14:6, 14:13, 14:23, 17:10, 17:20, 17:25, 18:17, 23:23, 24:7, 31:3, 31:5, 41:17, 43:14, 47:8, 49:4 meaning [19] - 3:20, 3:23, 4:1, 15:22, 16:1, 18:1, 24:8,

46:18, 46:25, 49:2, 50:4, 50:6, 50:15 meaningful [1] - 47:4 means [2] - 22:13, 31:10 meant [1] - 23:8 meet [1] - 51:1 membrane [6] - 20:6, 24:14, 24:18, 24:20, 33:3 mentioned [1] - 49:19 method [3] - 3:10, 12:23, 19:22 might [4] - 8:21, 17:21, 22:1, 32:21 missing [2] - 11:4, 24:24 mixed [1] - 10:22 months [2] - 51:19, 51:21 morning [1] - 3:5 most [1] - 15:1 motion [7] - 34:24, 45:6, 45:8, 45:10, 45:12, 45:17, 50:19 motions [1] - 27:11 move [1] - 51:16 MR [87] - 2:17, 3:5, 3:18, 3:21, 3:24, 4:2, 4:6, 4:8, 7:14, 7:19, 8:1, 8:7, 8:20, 9:11, 9:13, 10:25, 11:7, 11:17, 12:1, 13:16, 13:23, 14:7, 14:10, 14:18, 14:21, 15:7, 15:12, 15:14, 15:19, 16:3, 16:9, 16:12, 17:2, 17:12, 17:21, 18:23, 19:8, 19:13, 19:15, 20:8, 21:24, 22:4, 22:25, 23:3, 23:10, 23:18, 23:25, 24:23, 25:2, 25:17, 27:10, 27:20, 29:7, 29:10, 29:13, 29:17, 29:24, 30:16, 30:25, 31:5, 32:1, 32:6, 32:15, 32:24, 33:8, 33:17, 34:2, 34:13, 34:17, 35:3, 35:13, 35:22, 36:20, 37:12, 38:2, 38:18, 40:7, 40:8, 40:10, 41:17, 42:16, 43:1, 43:5, 51:5, 51:6, 51:7, 51:18 MS [1] - 2:23 multiple [3] - 11:19,

25:20, 29:5, 35:2,

45:3, 46:16, 46:17,

40:2, 43:6 **must** [5] - 5:21, 12:19, 15:18, 16:21, 50:12

## Ν

narrow [1] - 16:18 nature [1] - 42:18 **necessarily** [1] - 35:19 necessary [2] - 48:8, 48:9 need [4] - 16:14, 41:10, 46:23, 51:4 needs [2] - 35:21, 48:7 never [13] - 6:17, 12:3, 17:8, 26:25, 28:24, 30:21, 32:24, 36:5, 38:7, 38:23, 38:24, 40:12, 41:11 New [1] - 47:6 new [1] - 28:8 next [17] - 3:7, 3:12, 4:16, 6:19, 7:11, 9:25, 21:5, 21:13, 26:11. 26:13. 27:23. 28:6, 28:13, 33:21, 51:9, 51:19, 51:20 nice [1] - 51:20 Nicole [1] - 2:19 NICOLE [1] - 1:23 **nilly** [1] - 30:14 nobody [1] - 33:25 NOREIKA [1] - 1:15 note [1] - 12:21 noted [3] - 29:18, 34:18, 34:19 notes [1] - 52:1 nothing [8] - 24:21, 25:6, 33:20, 40:19, 40:22, 40:23, 44:7, 51.6

## 0

number [1] - 33:22

objection [1] - 47:9 obviously [2] - 5:25, 8:25 occur [1] - 35:18 OF [1] - 1:2 offered [1] - 37:8 Office [5] - 5:13, 21:8, 21:10, 43:7, 43:14 Official [1] - 52:3 old [1] - 17:13 one [24] - 7:12, 9:8, 10:17, 11:20, 11:23, 12:12, 15:8, 17:21, 18:9, 18:12, 23:8, 24:3, 27:10, 28:17,

33:22, 34:8, 37:9, 41:23, 44:22, 47:1, 50:20, 50:24 ones [1] - 13:19 online [1] - 47:10 opening [1] - 33:3 opinion [3] - 45:20, 45:22, 50:19 opinions [1] - 46:10 opportunity [1] -28:21 orally [1] - 50:19 orange [2] - 26:16, 27:13 order [6] - 7:10, 23:12, 31:23, 45:20, 46:10, 46:12 ordinary [19] - 3:20, 3:23, 4:1, 4:4, 13:13, 14:3, 15:22, 16:1, 18:1, 29:5, 35:2, 45:3, 46:16, 46:25, 49:5, 50:4, 50:6, 50:15 originally [2] - 21:8, 51:18 otherwise [1] - 12:12 outlet [2] - 13:12, 24:21 outstanding [1] -51:12 overcome [4] - 10:14, 23:12. 26:14. 48:13 overreading [1] -49:15 own [3] - 10:17, 10:25, 29:22

## Р

p.m [2] - 1:10, 51:24

pad [1] - 42:18

page [6] - 13:18, 22:6, 22:9, 22:15, 23:18, 38.20 pages [1] - 46:4 paper [1] - 7:15 paragraph [5] - 19:1, 22:9, 35:15, 42:18, 48:3 ParkerVision [1] -19:10 part [19] - 5:14, 7:18, 7:23, 7:25, 8:1, 8:5, 11:3, 21:17, 23:15, 23:21, 28:12, 30:8, 37:9, 38:12, 38:14, 43:16, 45:8, 47:23, 48:16 particular [2] - 12:22,

particularly [1] - 47:25 parties [7] - 6:5, 7:9, 30:3, 44:24, 45:1, 46:15, 50:10 parties' [5] - 4:17, 4:18, 5:17, 46:3, 47:5 partly [2] - 51:10, 51:11 party [1] - 28:16 passage [1] - 35:12 passageway [3] -20:5, 20:7, 47:23 passes [1] - 12:3 patent [5] - 15:11, 19:6, 20:19, 25:21, 28:3 Patent [13] - 3:9, 5:12, 16:13, 18:25, 19:19, 21:8, 21:10, 42:1, 43:7, 43:14, 46:14, 46:15 patents [6] - 3:8, 3:15, 10:11, 44:23, 45:24 pending [1] - 45:16 people [1] - 15:8 perceive [1] - 29:13 period [2] - 17:8, 51:18 permanently [2] -14:11. 47:22 permeable [20] - 9:18, 9:20, 9:23, 11:13, 20:6, 24:14, 24:17, 24:19, 24:20, 32:19, 36:14, 36:16, 36:24, 37:20, 43:9, 43:11, 47:18, 48:20 person [7] - 4:1, 4:4, 13:14, 14:3, 14:4, 49:5, 51:1 perspective[1] -29:18 Phillips [1] - 25:16 **PIANETTO**[1] - 2:6 Pianetto [1] - 3:1 picked [1] - 35:4 picture [1] - 30:20 piled [1] - 10:22 pin [3] - 13:1, 13:2 place [46] - 5:4, 5:22, 7:3, 7:23, 8:11, 8:12, 8:22, 9:2, 9:10, 11:8, 12:9, 12:13, 20:7, 20:10, 20:16, 20:18, 20:22, 21:1, 21:22, 22:14, 22:21, 23:7, 26:8, 26:10, 28:1,

28:5, 29:11, 29:14,

29:15, 29:19, 30:9, 31:1, 31:2, 32:8, 32:18, 34:8, 34:11, 35:20, 37:25, 38:3, 38:13, 38:16, 38:25, 39:19, 46:17, 50:2 plain [13] - 3:20, 3:23, 3:25, 15:22, 16:1, 29:5, 35:2, 45:3, 46:16, 46:25, 50:4, 50:6, 50:15 Plaintiff [15] - 1:5, 1:24, 2:18, 45:5, 45:12, 45:14, 46:16, 48:12, 48:14, 48:15, 48:22, 49:7, 49:8, 50:9, 51:6 Plaintiff's [4] - 46:25, 48:25, 49:16, 49:23 play [1] - 36:9 plead [1] - 26:8 pleadings [1] - 45:6 point [15] - 9:2, 15:9, 28:10, 28:19, 30:2, 34:19, 36:10, 36:16, 36:20, 37:5, 38:3, 39:1, 42:16, 44:6 pointed [11] - 18:13, 26:22, 28:2, 28:3, 31:6, 31:16, 33:18, 41:17, 44:9, 47:8 pointing [5] - 21:1, 21:25, 22:16, 43:13, 43:18 points [4] - 9:22, 31:12, 35:5, 38:18 polymer [4] - 5:4, 5:5, 20:25, 21:2 pool [2] - 35:20 pools [1] - 41:16 portion [2] - 6:25, 20:5 **POSA** [4] - 29:6, 49:2, 49:20. 50:6 POSAs [1] - 29:9 position [21] - 3:19, 6:8, 28:17, 28:18, 28:24, 30:12, 30:17, 30:18, 30:22, 31:24, 31:25, 32:1, 33:13, 33:16, 37:23, 39:22, 41:3, 44:15, 47:15, 48:11 positions [6] - 6:17, 27:4, 28:8, 28:15, 28:23, 39:9 possible [1] - 34:25 possibly [1] - 8:8 post [1] - 27:11 post-trial [1] - 27:11 precluded [1] - 45:10

preference [1] - 31:7 **pulled** [1] - 41:9 prejudice [1] - 28:18 **pump** [1] - 20:10 prepared [1] - 45:18 pumping [1] - 20:11 present [1] - 28:7 PureWick [49] - 2:18, 5:12, 5:24, 6:1, 6:7, presentations [1] -6:8, 6:9, 6:13, 6:15, pretty [1] - 41:16 6:21, 6:23, 9:14, prevail [1] - 28:16 9:21, 10:3, 10:7, 10:13, 12:7, 13:17, preventing [1] - 48:5 18:13, 19:21, 20:16, preview [1] - 4:23 21:14, 21:15, 21:22, previously [1] - 44:23 21:24, 22:6, 22:7, PrimaFit [2] - 41:6, 22:9, 26:2, 26:14, 49:13 26:15, 26:22, 26:24, problem [5] - 22:4, 27:3, 27:24, 28:7, 24:3, 25:1, 42:10, 28:15, 38:22, 46:1, 43:16 46:2, 46:10, 49:8, proceeded [1] - 30:25 49:16, 50:3, 51:10 proceeding [3] -**PUREWICK** [1] - 1:4 28:17, 28:18, 52:1 PureWick's [14] process [1] - 45:23 4:19, 7:3, 7:7, 7:15, product [4] - 6:22, 10:14, 11:22, 12:22, 12:19, 28:4, 49:24 14:14, 26:1, 26:2, PRODUCTS [1] - 1:7 27:13, 27:15, 28:22, Products [2] - 3:7, 32:9 46.1 purpose [1] - 48:5 **proof** [1] - 33:22 purposefully [1] properties [4] - 11:19, 9:15 11:20, 11:22, 17:23 purposes [3] - 27:25, property [4] - 11:21, 39:17, 41:20

12:12, 15:8, 17:25

proposal [1] - 3:22

proposed [2] - 30:7,

proposes [2] - 46:17,

proposition [1] -

prosecution [18] -

5:12, 8:14, 8:18,

8:22, 14:15, 21:8,

22:1, 25:15, 25:18,

25:22, 36:9, 36:10,

36:19, 37:16, 39:6,

42:1, 48:10, 48:12

prove [2] - 40:17,

proved [1] - 34:22

proven [1] - 34:9

provide [1] - 6:17

30:6, 38:3

provided [4] - 10:15,

provides [6] - 7:23,

24:11, 30:8, 38:4,

proximate [3] - 32:19,

**PTO** [2] - 39:3, 39:4

public [3] - 5:13, 9:6,

38:12, 38:15

36:15, 43:12

21:16

pull [1] - 16:7

44:14

46:18

19:17

## Q

pushed [1] - 43:19

38:10

put [4] - 27:9, 33:19,

Qualcomm [1] - 19:11 quantity [1] - 18:4 quarter [1] - 9:3 questionable [1] -39:24 questions [3] - 35:5, 40:4, 42:22 QUINN [1] - 1:22 Quinn [1] - 2:18 quote [1] - 42:17 quotes [1] - 39:15

#### R

rate [1] - 36:5 rather [5] - 8:18, 46:22, 48:6, 49:21, 50:21 re [1] - 19:14 reaching [1] - 40:1 read [21] - 10:7, 12:14, 13:19, 15:3, 16:7, 16:15, 21:3, 22:11, 22:12, 23:2, 23:23,

23:25, 24:25, 37:4, 42:13, 46:2, 46:7, 47:24, 48:10, 48:23, reading [1] - 13:10 reads [2] - 11:22, 11:23 real [1] - 28:22 really [4] - 7:6, 36:13, 41:24, 45:10 reason [4] - 9:23, 41:1, 43:9, 48:4 reasons [1] - 43:6 receive [1] - 18:15 received [1] - 4:15 receives [1] - 19:21 receiving [1] - 3:10 recess [1] - 44:19 recite [1] - 19:23 recites [4] - 4:10, 4:11, 4:14, 12:18 recognize [2] - 32:3, 34:23 recognized [2] - 16:2, 35:6 reconcile [1] - 26:25 record [2] - 45:25, 46:8 refer [3] - 5:3, 10:11, 46:23 reference [14] - 6:10, 8:12, 8:15, 8:23, 14:12, 20:8, 20:24, 21:9, 24:4, 25:20, 26:15, 41:18, 48:12, 49:9 referenced [1] - 20:23 references [2] - 27:7, 46:4 referencing [1] - 8:24 referred [3] - 8:13, 21:18, 49:17 referring [6] - 8:8, 11:18, 14:12, 20:9, 25.10 refers [5] - 5:8, 11:19, 16:5, 20:21, 47:22 reflect [1] - 18:2 regarding [2] - 46:3, 51:10 regardless [2] - 6:14, 14:13 regards [1] - 2:20 rejected [1] - 21:9 rejection [1] - 48:14 related [1] - 32:10 relating [1] - 32:11 relevant [2] - 26:4, 32.4

relying [1] - 22:10

remind [2] - 37:22, 38.1 removed [2] - 35:16, 35:18 removing [1] - 48:6 repeatedly [10] - 3:15, 4:8, 5:2, 5:7, 8:13, 8:15, 20:21, 21:18, 24:9, 27:25 report [3] - 39:14, 42:17, 51:2 Reporter [1] - 52:3 requests [1] - 50:25 require [4] - 7:16, 12:10, 47:14, 47:24 required [5] - 17:25, 27:21, 37:10, 48:4, 50:11 requires [2] - 19:24, 46:22 requiring [1] - 48:9 reservoir [153] - 3:14, 4:10, 4:13, 4:15, 4:19, 5:3, 5:4, 5:8, 5:13, 5:22, 6:10, 6:14, 6:23, 7:2, 7:9, 7:17, 8:4, 8:10, 8:25, 9:3, 9:4, 9:5, 9:7, 9:17, 9:20, 9:22, 10:11, 11:12, 11:20, 12:11, 12:12, 13:7, 13:11, 13:13, 13:20, 13:24, 14:2, 15:4, 15:10, 15:13, 15:15, 16:17, 17:4, 17:8, 17:23, 17:25, 18:1, 19:3, 19:6, 19:7, 19:20, 19:24, 19:25, 20:1, 20:4, 20:5, 20:21, 20:25, 21:10, 21:12, 21:15, 21:16, 22:21, 22:23, 23:1, 23:14, 24:5, 24:9, 24:12, 24:16, 24:20, 25:5, 25:7, 26:6, 26:18, 27:13, 27:19, 27:21, 28:1, 28:4, 28:10, 28:11, 29:4, 29:5, 29:21, 30:4, 31:1, 31:20, 32:16, 32:17, 32:20, 32:22, 33:4, 33:21, 34:6, 35:7, 36:12, 36:15, 36:23, 37:2, 37:4, 37:14, 37:19, 38:3, 38:4, 38:5, 40:13, 40:16. 40:18. 40:19. 40:23. 41:2. 41:19. 42:5, 42:8, 43:6, 43:12, 43:14, 43:15,

44:3, 44:7, 44:8, 45:2, 45:13, 46:13, 46:14, 46:22, 46:24, 47:17, 47:20, 47:23, 47:25, 48:1, 48:15, 48:19, 49:4, 49:10, 49:11, 49:17, 49:20, 49:22, 50:5, 50:6, 50:11, 50:12, 50:16 reservoirs [4] - 32:14, 32:22, 32:25, 33:1 respect [4] - 25:14, 27:4, 34:23, 34:25 respond [1] - 40:8 response [1] - 45:8 rest [2] - 19:8, 23:3 result [2] - 13:4, 13:6 resulted [1] - 44:24 retains [1] - 44:2 reviewed [2] - 45:24, 45:25 rise [1] - 51:23 **ROBERT**[1] - 2:7 Robert [1] - 2:25 room [1] - 48:19 rule [3] - 45:16, 45:18, 50:18 ruling [2] - 46:7, 46:11 rulings [1] - 45:20 RYAN[1] - 2:6 Ryan [1] - 3:1

## S

**SAGE** [1] - 1:7 Sage [6] - 2:24, 3:4, 3:6, 7:16, 38:19, 46.1 Sage's [1] - 4:20 **SAMANTHA**[1] - 2:3 **Samantha** [1] - 3:2 satisfying [1] - 9:24 SCHARFF [59] - 2:6, 3:5, 3:18, 3:21, 3:24, 4:2, 4:6, 4:8, 7:14, 7:19, 8:1, 8:7, 8:20, 9:11, 9:13, 10:25, 11:7, 11:17, 12:1, 13:16, 13:23, 14:7, 14:10, 14:18, 14:21, 15:7, 15:12, 15:14, 15:19, 16:3, 16:9, 16:12, 17:2, 17:12, 17:21, 18:23, 19:8, 19:13, 19:15, 20:8, 21:24, 22:4, 22:25, 23:3, 23:10, 23:18, 23:25, 24:23, 25:2, 25:17, 27:10, 27:20, 40:8, 40:10, 41:17,

42:16, 51:5, 51:7, 51:18 Scharff [2] - 2:25, 3:6 scope [1] - 45:4 seated [2] - 2:14, 44:21 second [6] - 7:12, 12:6, 13:12, 29:3, 41:21, 48:10 secondly [1] - 43:5 **secretion** [5] - 5:15, 21:17, 23:15, 23:21, 48:17 section [1] - 46:9 sectional [1] - 24:11 see [5] - 9:14, 9:21, 22:8, 26:16, 30:16 seeing [1] - 42:11 seem [1] - 31:21 semantic [1] - 5:25 send [1] - 2:20 sentence [3] - 14:10, 22:9, 22:10 separate [6] - 7:17, 7:20, 36:24, 38:15, 43:8, 50:11 set [2] - 46:12, 51:9 several [2] - 18:13, 18:15 **shape** [7] - 11:12, 15:5, 16:17, 17:11, 17:13, 47:17, 48:1 **Shaw** [2] - 2:16, 2:18 **SHAW** [3] - 1:19, 1:20, 2:17 **SHEA** [1] - 2:3 Sheldon [1] - 14:23 shifting [2] - 28:15, show [4] - 11:6, 24:16, 30:1, 31:24 showed [1] - 30:20 shows [2] - 14:12, 27:3 significant [1] - 6:3 similar [1] - 13:7 similarly [1] - 24:16 **simply** [6] - 4:19, 5:15, 5:22, 14:24, 18:17, 30.2 simultaneous [1] -31:19

simultaneously [2] -

35:16, 35:18

40:2

48:1

single [1] - 25:20

situation [2] - 36:7,

size [6] - 11:12, 15:5,

16:17, 17:11, 47:17,

sized [4] - 17:15, 17:17, 17:18, 26:6 skill [2] - 4:1, 4:4 skilled [3] - 13:14, 14:4, 49:5 slide [35] - 3:7, 3:12, 4:16, 4:25, 5:6, 5:10, 5:16, 6:19, 7:11, 8:20, 9:13, 9:25, 12:5, 16:3, 17:22, 18:5, 18:7, 20:13, 21:5, 21:13, 22:22, 25:24, 26:11, 26:13, 27:23, 28:6, 28:13, 30:20, 40:11, 41:22, 41:23, 42:4, 43:17 small [4] - 17:6, 17:18, 35:17, 47:21 sorry [6] - 14:18, 14:21, 16:12, 19:15, 25:24, 44:20 sort [1] - 43:5 sound [1] - 19:21 space [89] - 6:9, 6:12, 6:14, 7:4, 7:5, 7:6, 8:14, 8:18, 8:19, 8:21, 8:23, 9:1, 9:10, 9:17, 11:8, 11:9, 12:15, 22:12, 22:15, 22:24, 23:2, 23:13, 23:24, 24:3, 24:10, 24:13, 25:4, 25:7, 25:9, 26:19, 28:11, 29:11, 29:14, 29:18, 30:5, 32:12, 33:8, 33:11, 33:12, 34:9, 34:12, 34:14, 34:15, 35:23, 35:25, 36:12, 36:13, 36:17, 36:22, 37:1, 37:3, 37:5, 37:6, 37:14, 37:18, 37:19, 37:25, 38:3, 38:7, 38:14, 39:17, 41:1, 41:2, 41:25, 42:2, 42:3, 42:8, 42:19, 42:21, 42:25, 43:8, 43:13, 43:21, 43:22, 43:24, 44:3, 44:11, 48:18, 48:24, 49:25, 50:7, 50:9, 50:16, 51:20 spacing [1] - 21:20 spec [2] - 14:15, 36:1 specific [4] - 12:18, 13:1, 21:17, 32:18 specifically [11] -5:12, 10:11, 10:18, 11:1, 21:15, 26:5, 26:16, 32:16, 40:18, 42:1, 50:8

specification [21] -5:7, 10:10, 11:11, 11:19, 15:4, 15:24, 16:4, 18:21, 19:6, 20:20, 22:11, 24:18, 30:1, 31:15, 31:16, 31:19, 35:15, 47:16, 48:23 specifics [2] - 19:12, 19:16 **spots** [1] - 26:23 stand [1] - 27:12 standard [1] - 46:9 **STARGATT**[1] - 2:2 start [4] - 2:14, 3:3, 3:7, 16:23 started [1] - 17:1 starting [1] - 16:16 starts [1] - 35:7 state [1] - 45:24 statement [5] - 15:19, 39:19, 40:1, 46:25, 48:1 statements [2] -13:17, 47:24 states [2] - 24:18, 47:16 STATES[1] - 1:1 States [1] - 1:15 stating [2] - 45:20, 48:22 status [1] - 51:8 stenographic [1] -52:1 still [5] - 8:2, 8:7, 10:7, 40:25, 51:14 stirring [1] - 34:21 storage [1] - 20:10 store [2] - 18:4, 41:10 stored [1] - 12:4 storing [1] - 14:13 Street [1] - 1:12 structure [69] - 4:21, 5:3, 5:23, 6:22, 7:16, 7:17, 7:20, 7:21, 7:23, 7:25, 8:2, 8:6, 8:8, 8:9, 8:12, 8:19, 9:1, 9:7, 11:10, 12:8, 12:11, 12:18, 12:19, 12:20, 13:1, 14:9, 19:25, 20:16, 20:21, 22:16, 22:18, 25:12, 26:17, 28:1, 28:9, 29:12, 29:16, 29:19, 29:22, 29:23, 30:6, 30:7, 30:8, 37:23, 37:24, 37:25, 38:6, 38:10, 38:12, 38:13, 38:14, 38:15, 38:21,

38:24, 39:4, 40:24,

46:18, 46:24, 50:8, 50:10, 50:11, 50:13 structures [4] - 8:16, 8:24, 21:19, 22:16 stuff [1] - 22:3 stuffing [4] - 7:5, 25:7, 28:12, 32:12 **submit** [1] - 51:14 **submitted** [1] - 46:4 subsequent [2] -47:24, 48:21 sucked [2] - 35:21, 35:25 suggested [2] - 34:3, 39:7 suggesting [1] - 31:21 **suggestion** [1] - 38:8 suggests [1] - 47:13 suitable [4] - 11:12, 15:5, 17:11, 47:17 **SULLIVAN** [1] - 1:22 sump [9] - 20:5, 20:9, 20:10, 20:11, 26:6, 35:11, 42:25, 47:23 support [23] - 4:12, 5:2, 9:18, 9:20, 9:23, 11:14, 14:1, 24:14, 24:17, 24:20, 32:19, 33:4, 33:11, 36:14, 36:17, 36:24, 37:20, 43:9, 43:11, 47:19, 48:11, 48:20, 50:15 supported [2] - 47:1, 47:15 **supports** [2] - 4:24, 48:25 **supposed** [5] - 10:23, 15:25, 16:25, 22:2, 31:18 surface [1] - 32:14 **SURRETTE** [1] - 2:7 Surrette [1] - 2:25 surrounded [2] -43:19, 43:21 switched [1] - 28:8 synonym [1] - 10:23 synonymous [1] -31:11 synonyms[3] - 10:21, 31:7, 47:10

# Т

talks [3] - 19:7, 31:16, 35:15 tangible [2] - 20:21, 28:9 TAYLOR [1] - 2:2 teaches [1] - 31:19 temporarily [6] -

14:11, 16:19, 17:4, 35:11, 36:4, 47:22 temporary [1] - 35:18 term [28] - 3:13, 3:14, 3:20, 4:8, 4:18, 5:18, 6:6, 6:20, 13:7, 18:1, 22:11, 23:1, 29:4, 30:3, 30:4, 31:9, 37:4, 38:22, 44:23, 45:2, 45:4, 46:5, 46:13, 46:16, 46:22, 47:2, 48:24 terms [3] - 27:21, 31:11, 39:5 terribly [1] - 14:6 test [1] - 3:25 testified [7] - 4:3, 26:2, 27:12, 29:9, 41:12, 49:3, 49:19 testify [2] - 34:14, 43:2 testimony [4] - 15:1, 41:14, 49:22, 50:3 **THE** [90] - 1:1, 1:2, 1:15, 2:13, 2:22, 3:3, 3:17, 3:19, 3:22, 3:25, 4:3, 4:7, 7:12, 7:15, 7:21, 8:3, 8:17, 9:9, 9:12, 10:20, 11:6, 11:11, 11:24, 13:9, 13:19, 14:2, 14:8, 14:17, 14:19, 15:3, 15:10, 15:13, 15:15, 15:21, 16:6, 16:11, 16:14, 17:9, 17:13, 18:19, 19:3, 19:10, 19:14, 20:3, 21:21, 21:25, 22:23, 23:1, 23:6, 23:16, 23:20, 24:7, 24:24, 25:14, 27:6, 27:18, 29:3, 29:8, 29:11, 29:16, 29:21, 30:10, 30:19, 31:3, 31:24, 32:3, 32:9, 32:21, 33:7, 33:15, 33:25, 34:12, 34:16, 34:23, 35:8, 35:19, 36:19, 37:7, 37:22, 38:17, 40:6, 40:9, 41:14, 42:10, 42:24, 43:3, 44:16, 44:20, 51:16, 51:22 theirs [1] - 10:2 themselves [1] - 5:1 theoretically [2] -12:10, 13:3 therein [1] - 24:10 Thesaruis.com [1] -10:20

thesaurus [1] - 47:10

they've [1] - 44:9 thin [1] - 22:19 Third [1] - 39:21 third [4] - 5:21, 7:9, 20:14, 42:16 thorough [1] - 45:23 three [2] - 5:18, 10:1 throughout [1] - 4:9 today [4] - 2:25, 46:6, 46:11, 51:3 together [1] - 24:1 took [2] - 30:18, 33:14 top [3] - 6:20, 22:8, 23:18 total [1] - 10:22 totally [1] - 34:7 touched [4] - 20:15, 26:13, 27:17, 39:11 trace [2] - 6:25, 9:5 traced [1] - 26:16 track [1] - 50:23 transcript [2] - 13:16, 52:1 transport [1] - 15:8 transported [2] -11:13, 47:18 treated [3] - 30:3, 30:4, 39:12 trial [9] - 4:4, 26:23, 27:11, 29:9, 33:18, 43:2, 49:21, 51:16 triangle [1] - 44:10 tried [2] - 10:16, 27:3 true [3] - 38:23, 39:3, 52:1 trying [4] - 10:7, 19:21, 19:22, 32:5 tube [12] - 4:13, 7:5, 7:6, 12:16, 31:18, 32:13, 33:12, 35:23, 35:25, 36:4, 43:18 turn [8] - 3:12, 10:1, 17:22, 19:22, 20:13, 22:22, 25:24, 42:4 two [9] - 3:8, 3:15, 4:18, 5:19, 10:10,

## U

23:25, 44:23, 47:7,

47:10

U.S [1] - 52:4 ultimately [1] - 36:23 unable [1] - 2:21 unavailable [1] -51:13 unbounded [2] - 8:12, 20:19 under [6] - 7:3, 12:13, 24:5, 28:14, 31:1,

32:9 understood [2] - 32:6, undetermined [1] -28:11 **UNITED** [1] - 1:1 United [1] - 1:15 unless [3] - 18:5, 40:4, 42:22 **unopposed** [1] - 51:15 **up** [10] - 10:20, 11:8, 16:7, 27:15, 30:20, 31:18, 31:22, 35:4, 36:17, 37:1 urine [81] - 3:11, 4:15, 4:20, 4:21, 5:20, 6:11, 6:15, 6:25, 7:1, 7:4, 7:7, 8:14, 10:12, 11:5, 12:9, 12:13, 15:5, 17:16, 17:17, 17:19, 17:24, 18:11, 18:15, 19:21, 20:6, 20:10, 25:3, 25:13, 26:18. 26:19. 26:20. 30:9, 31:17, 31:18, 31:19, 31:22, 32:10, 32:11, 32:12, 33:1, 33:2, 33:9, 33:10, 34:5, 34:9, 34:14, 35:16, 35:19, 35:24, 36:1, 36:2, 36:5, 37:17, 38:5, 38:13, 38:16, 38:22, 39:5, 39:16, 39:18, 39:19, 40:20, 40:21, 40:23, 41:9, 41:16, 41:18, 42:9, 46:17, 46:19, 46:22, 47:20, 47:25, 48:4, 48:5, 49:10, 49:18, 49:25, 50:16 URQUHART [1] - 1:22 uses [1] - 10:5

## V

vacuum [2] - 32:13,

36:2

vague [3] - 6:24, 9:15,
28:11

validity [1] - 50:1

Van [27] - 6:9, 10:14,
26:14, 26:17, 27:1,
27:9, 27:12, 27:14,
27:21, 28:25, 31:25,
33:16, 33:17, 34:4,
34:9, 34:19, 40:14,
40:15, 40:17, 41:11,
41:12, 41:17, 44:6,
44:13, 49:9, 50:1

VDO [1] - 13:6

verdict [3] - 40:1, 43:4, 44:25 versus [11] - 5:18, 6:8, 10:16, 11:8, 12:9, 18:8, 20:16, 29:11, 29:12, 30:17, 33:5 view [3] - 21:9, 24:12, 31:1 Vitronics [1] - 25:19 void [24] - 8:14, 8:18, 8:23, 22:12, 22:15, 23:2, 23:13, 23:24, 24:2, 24:10, 24:12, 25:4, 25:7, 25:9, 37:3, 37:5, 37:14, 37:19, 41:25, 42:2, 42:8, 42:21, 48:24 volume [3] - 26:7, 39:16, 49:18

#### W

wait [1] - 15:23 waiting [2] - 44:20, 51:14 wants [2] - 6:23, 38:10 Webster's [11] - 22:7, 23:4, 23:20, 23:22, 24:1, 24:6, 25:11, 37:8, 37:10, 47:6, 48:15 week [2] - 2:20, 51:9 whereas [3] - 4:20, 8:12, 37:18 wherein [3] - 5:4, 20:25, 24:12 whole [1] - 48:10 willy [1] - 30:14 willy-nilly [1] - 30:14 Wilmington [1] - 1:13 WILSON [1] - 2:3 Wilson [1] - 3:2 witness [1] - 51:13 word [7] - 10:5, 10:6, 10:7, 10:13, 11:3, 19:5, 50:8 words [5] - 18:20, 24:15, 42:11, 42:12, 47:10 World [1] - 47:6 worry [1] - 30:14 worth [1] - 38:19 written [2] - 45:19, 45:22

## Υ

yesterday [1] - 7:15 YOUNG [1] - 2:2 Young [1] - 2:24